arXiv:1412.1517v1 [math.FA] 3 Dec 2014

LIOUVILLE PROPERTY AND AMENABILITY FOR SEMIGROUPS AND GROUPOIDS

CHO-HO CHU AND XIN LI

Abstract. We study the close relationships between the Liouville property, Reiter's condition and amenability for semigroupoids, in both measurable and topological settings. In particular, we show the equivalence of the Liouville property and Reiter's condition. Applied to groupoids, this confirms a conjecture of Kaimanovich that the Liouville property and amenability are equivalent. The relationships of these three conditions are also clarified in the subclass of semigroups and transformation semigroups.

1. Introduction

The objective of this paper is to study amenability and the Liouville property for semigroupoids, and clarify their relationships in several important special cases. Although the equivalence of these two concepts in locally compact groups is well-known, their exact relationship in the wider setting of groupoids, semigroups or transformation semigroups is less understood.

Our goal is to remedy this situation. Indeed, we expose the intimate connections between the notions of Liouville property, Reiter's condition and amenability for even more general "group-like" objects, namely semigroupoids, which include groupoids, semigroups and transformation semigroups as special cases. We show that, for semigroupoids, the Liouville property is equivalent to Reiter's condition, whereas for semigroups, the latter always implies amenability, and the two are actually equivalent for groupoids and countable discrete semigroups. A consequence of our result is an affirmative answer to a conjecture of Kaimanovich [15] on the equivalence of amenability and the Liouville property for measured groupoids as well as locally compact groupoids.

To introduce the Liouville property, which plays an important role in geometric analysis and probability, we begin with a connected Lie group G. It is well-known that the Laplace-Beltrami operator Δ of G generates a one-parameter semigroup $(\mu_t)_{t>0}$ of probability measures on G such that a function $f \in L^\infty(G)$ satisfies the convolution equations $f = f * \mu_t$ for all $t > 0$ if and only if it is C^2 and harmonic, that is, $\Delta f = 0$ (cf. [13] and [3, Proposition V.6]). It follows from a result of Yau [31] that a Liouville theorem, which asserts the absence of a non-constant bounded harmonic function on G, holds if G has non-negative Ricci curvature. In this case, we say that G has the *Liouville property* (e.g. [11]). More generally, given a locally compact group G with a probability measure π, we call a Borel function $f : G \to \mathbb{C}$ π-*harmonic* if $f = f * \pi$. We say that G has the *Liouville property for* π if all bounded π-harmonic functions on G are constant. While the Liouville property for a manifold depends on its curvature, the Liouville property for measures on groups is closely related to amenability. Indeed, a locally compact group G is necessarily amenable if it has the Liouville property for some π. Conversely, it

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 20L05, 43A05; Secondary 20M30, 22A22, 45E10.

has been shown in [16] that a countable discrete amenable group, and in [29] any σ-compact locally compact amenable group G enjoys the Liouville property for some absolutely continuous symmetric probability measure π on G. In probability, the importance of the Liouville property for measures on groups G can be gleaned from the fact that it is equivalent to the triviality of the Poisson boundary of random walks on G.

The concept of amenability plays a significant role in geometric group theory, harmonic analysis and ergodic theory. A locally compact group G is *amenable* if there exists an invariant mean on $L^\infty(G)$. This concept can be extended to group actions and has a huge impact on operator algebras and their applications. It is closely related to injectivity of von Neumann algebras and nuclearity of C*-algebras, both are among the most fundamental regularity properties in the classification programme for these algebras (cf. [8, 28]). Amenability also has an important role in the progress on the Novikov conjecture (see [21]).

The equivalence of the Liouville property and amenability for groups was first conjectured by Furstenberg [12]. It is true for σ-compact locally compact groups by the aforementioned results of [16, 29]. For groupoids, the notion of amenability was introduced by Zimmer [32, 33] for group actions in the measurable setting and by Renault in the general case of measured and topological groupoids [26, 1]. More recently, Kaimanovich introduced the Liouville property for measured and topological groupoids and provided a first link between amenability and the Liouville property by proving that the latter always implies the former in [15], where it is conjectured that the converse should hold as well. For semigroups, the notion of amenability goes back to Day [23] and the Liouville property for measures on abelian semigroups has been studied in [9, 17, 24]. However, the relationship between these two notions for semigroups has not been the subject of investigation before.

In the present paper, we introduce and study the Liouville property and Reiter's condition in the setting of semigroupoids which subsumes all the cases mentioned above. Semigroupoids generalise semigroups and groupoids. They can be viewed as *'semigroups'* in which multiplication is not globally defined, or alternatively, as *'groupoids'* without invertibility.

The concept of convolution on groups extends naturally to semigroupoids. To motivate our investigation, we begin with the Liouville property and amenability for metric semigroups, which are defined in terms of bounded uniformly continuous functions. For semigroupoids, where we assume the existence of a weaker version of a Haar system of measures, the Liouville property is defined in terms of Borel functions essentially bounded with respect to the Haar system. When discrete semigroups are considered as semigroupoids, the two notions of Liouville property coincide.

It turns out that for semigroupoids, Reiter's condition plays the role of amenability. Reiter's condition asserts the existence of a net of approximately invariant probability measures. For groups and groupoids, there is no difference between Reiter's condition and amenability, but for general semigroups, these notions do not necessarily agree. Like groupoids, one can study semigroupoids in measurable as well as topological contexts. Our main result says that for measure semigroupoids, Reiter's condition and the Liouville property are equivalent. For topological semigroupoids, we prove an analogous result with a strong form of Reiter's condition. These nuances disappear in the special cases of groupoids, discrete semigroups and transformation semigroups.

Besides developing new ideas and techniques for semigroupoids, we make use of 0-2 laws for Markov operators as in [15] to go from the Liouville property to Reiter's condition. For the converse, we adapt the approach of [16]. For metric semigroups without a Haar system, we show that Reiter's condition implies the Liouville property, which in turn implies amenability. To prove the last implication, the method we used is different from that for semigroupoids.

Our paper is structured as follows: We begin with the discussion of metrizable semigroups in § 2 and give examples of semigroups with the Liouville property in § 3, these are discrete semigroups which admit a so-called central series and are a generalisation of nilpotent groups. Semigroupoids are introduced in § 4, as well as Reiter's conditions and the Liouville property for them. We discuss convolution of systems of measures on semigroupoids in § 5. We show in § 6 that the Liouville property implies Reiter's condition for semigroupoids, both in the measurable and topological setting. The converse is proved in § 7. The last section (§ 8) is devoted to the special cases of groupoids, transformation semigroups and locally compact semigroups.

2. Liouville property and amenability for metric semigroups

To motivate the study of semigroupoids, we begin with semigroups and focus on the relationship between the Liouville property and amenability.

By a *topological semigroup*, we mean a semigroup S endowed with a topology such that the multiplication on S is jointly continuous. If moreover, the topology is metrizable, we call S a *metric semigroup*.

Let us first fix some notations for measures and functions on a topological space X. A positive finite Borel measure μ on X is called *tight* if for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a compact set $K \subseteq X$ such that $\mu(X \setminus K) < \varepsilon$. We note that every positive finite Borel measure on a *complete separable* metric space is tight.

Let $M(X)$ be the space of complex-valued Borel measures on X. For each nonzero $\mu \in M(X)$, the *support* of μ is defined by

$$\operatorname{supp}\mu = \bigcap \{F \subseteq X : F \text{ is closed, } \mu(F) = \mu(X)\}$$

and the norm of μ is defined by $\|\mu\| = |\mu|(X)$ where $|\mu|$ is the total variation of μ. A measure $\mu \in M(X)$ is called *tight* if $|\mu|$ is tight. Every Borel measure with compact support is a tight measure. We denote by $M_t(X)$ the subspace of $M(X)$ consisting of tight measures on X. Let $C_b(X)$ be the C^*-algebra of bounded complex continuous functions on X and $C_c(X)$ the subspace of functions with compact support.

From now on, let X be a metric space. Then the support $\operatorname{supp}\mu$ of each $\mu \in M_t(X)$ is nonempty and separable. Moreover, for every Borel set $B \subseteq X$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a compact set $K \subseteq B$ satisfying $\mu(B \setminus K) < \varepsilon$. Also $\big(M(X), \|\cdot\|\big)$ is isometric to, and henceforth identifies as, a subspace of $C_b(X)^*$, which is equipped with the weak* topology. Recall that a net $(\mu_\alpha)_\alpha$ in $M(X)$ weak*-converges (w*-converges for short) to $\mu \in M(X)$ if, and only if, $\int_X f d\mu_\alpha \to \int_X f d\mu$ for all $f \in C_b(X)$. We often write $\langle \mu, f\rangle$ for $\int_X f d\mu$.

Let $M^+(X)$ be the cone of positive measures in $M(X)$. Then, by [22, Chapter II, Theorem 6.2], $M^+(X)$ is separable and metrizable in the w*-topology if X is a separable metric space.

We recall that a topological space Y is a *Polish space* if it is homeomorphic to a complete metrizable space. A subset of Y is called *analytic* if it is of form $f(Z)$ for some continuous function f from a Polish space Z to Y. Every Borel set in a Polish space is analytic.

In the sequel, by an *analytic* Borel space, we mean a measurable space $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{B})$ which is isomorphic to an analytic set in a Polish space with the relative Borel structure. The sets in the σ-algebra $\mathcal{B}$ are called the *Borel sets* in $\mathcal{G}$. The σ-algebra $\mathcal{B}$ is often not written explicitly for an analytic Borel space $\mathcal{G}$. We refer to [2] for the basic properties of analytic Borel spaces.

Remark 2.1. Since an uncountable Polish space with its Borel structure is isomorphic to the unit interval $[0, 1]$ with the usual Borel structure [18, p. 451], we see that the Banach space $L^1(Y, \mu)$ is separable for any Borel measure μ on a Polish space Y. The same is true for $L^1(\mathcal{G}, \nu)$, where ν is a Borel measure on an analytic Borel space $\mathcal{G}$.

Let S be a metric semigroup. Given $\pi, \sigma \in M(S)$ with product measure $\pi \times \sigma$, we define their convolution $\pi * \sigma$ by

$$(\pi * \sigma)(E) = \int_{S\times S} \chi_E(xy) d(\pi \times \sigma)(x, y)$$

for each Borel set $E \subseteq S$. For $f \in C_b(S)$, we have

$$\int_S f d(\pi * \sigma) = \int_S \int_S f(xy) d\pi(x) d\sigma(y).$$

In the sequel, we denote by π^n the n-fold convolution $\overbrace{\pi * \cdots * \pi}^{\text{n−times}}$ of π.

Given $f \in C_b(S)$ and $\pi \in M(S)$, we define the *semigroup convolutions* $f * \pi$ and $\pi * f$ by

$$(f * \pi)(x) = \int_S f(xy) d\pi(y) \quad \text{and} \quad (\pi * f)(x) = \int_S f(yx) d\pi(y).$$

If δ_a is the point mass at $a \in S$, then we have $(\delta_a * f)(x) = f(ax)$ and $(f * \delta_a)(x) = f(xa)$ as well as

$$\int_S (\delta_a * f) d\pi = \int_S f d(\delta_a * \pi).$$

Remark 2.2. For a locally compact group S with a left Haar measure and modular function $\triangle$, the group convolution $f * \pi$ is usually defined by $f * \pi(x) = \int_S f(xy^{-1}) \triangle(y^{-1}) d\pi(y)$ which is different from the semigroup convolution defined above. Unless we encounter a group structure and the distinction needs to be made, we shall use the term *convolution* to mean a *semigroup convolution*. Of course, if we define the measure $\widetilde{\pi}$ on the group S by $d\widetilde{\pi}(y) := \triangle(y) d\pi(y^{-1})$, then the group convolution of f and $\widetilde{\pi}$ is the same as the semigroup convolution $f * \pi$.

Definition 2.3. Let S be a metric semigroup. A function $f \in C_b(S)$ is called *left uniformly continuous* if the mapping

$$a \in S \mapsto \delta_a * f \in C_b(S)$$

is continuous. The space of bounded left uniformly continuous functions on S will be denoted by $LUC(S)$ which forms a sub-C*-algebra of $C_b(S)$.

Remark 2.4. Let $f \in C_b(S)$. Then $f \in LUC(S)$ if and only if the family $\{f * \delta_s : s \in S\}$ of right translations of f is equicontinuous on S. Indeed, $f \in LUC(S)$ if and only if for each $a \in S$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a neighbourhood N of a such that $b \in N$ implies $\|\delta_b * f - \delta_a * f\| < \varepsilon$, that is, $|f * \delta_s(b) - f * \delta_s(a)| < \varepsilon$ for all $s \in S$. It is easily seen that for each $f \in LUC(S)$ and $\pi \in M(S)$, the convolution $f * \pi$ is a bounded continuous function on S. In fact, we have $f * \pi \in LUC(S)$ since $\|f * \pi\| \leq \|f\|\|\pi\|$.

Definition 2.5. A metric semigroup S is called *left amenable*, or simply, *amenable*, if there is a left invariant mean on $LUC(S)$, that is, there exists a norm-one positive linear functional $\varphi : LUC(S) \to \mathbb{C}$ which is left invariant:

$$\varphi(\delta_a * f) = \varphi(f) \qquad (a \in S).$$

Definition 2.6. Let S be a metric semigroup and let $\pi \in M(S)$ be a probability measure. A function $f \in LUC(S)$ is called *π-harmonic* if $f * \pi = f$. Let $H_\pi(S)$ denote the closed subspace of $LUC(S)$ consisting of π-harmonic functions on S.

Definition 2.7. Let $\pi \in M(S)$ be a probability measure on S. We say that S has the *Liouville property* for π if every bounded left uniformly continuous π-harmonic function on S is constant, in other words, $H_\pi(S) = \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}$ where $\mathbf{1}$ denotes the constant function on S with value 1. We say that S has the *Liouville property* if it has the Liouville property for some tight probability measure π on S.

Our first objective is to show that the Liouville property implies amenability for metric semigroups. This requires some preparation. Let ρ be the topology of pointwise convergence in $LUC(S)$ and let τ be the topology of uniform convergence on compact sets in S.

Lemma 2.8. *Let S be a metric semigroup and let $f \in LUC(S)$. Denote by K_f the ρ-closure $\overline{\mathrm{co}}^{\,\rho}\{f * \delta_s : s \in S\}$ of the convex hull of $\{f * \delta_s : s \in S\}$. Then the two topologies ρ and τ coincide on K_f which is compact in these topologies.*

Proof. Since S is a metric space and it has been observed in Remark 2.4 that the family $\{f * \delta_s : s \in S\}$ is equicontinuous on S, it follows that K_f is compact in the topology τ of uniform convergence on compact sets in S (cf. [30, Theorem 43.15]). The topology τ is stronger than the pointwise topology ρ. Therefore they must coincide on K_f. □

Lemma 2.9. *Let $f \in LUC(S)$ and $\pi \in M(S)$ be a probability measure. Then $f * \pi \in K_f$.*

Proof. We first observe, as in the proof of [4, Theorem 12.11], that the cone $M^+(S) \subseteq C_b(S)^*$ coincides with the bipolar B^{00} of the convex hull $B = \mathrm{co}\{\delta_s : s \in S\}$ of point masses δ_s on S. Since B^{00} is the w*-closed convex hull of $B \cup \{0\}$ (cf. [4, Theorem 22.7]), we see that the probability measure π is the w*-limit of a net $(\pi_\alpha)_\alpha$ in B.

Now the lemma follows from the fact that

$$(f * \pi)(x) = \int_S (\delta_x * f) d\pi = \lim_\alpha \int_S (\delta_x * f) d\pi_\alpha$$

and for $\pi_\alpha = \sum_i \lambda_i^\alpha \delta_{s_i^\alpha}$ with $\sum_i \lambda_i^\alpha = 1$, $\lambda_i^\alpha \geq 0$, we have

$$\int_S (\delta_x * f) d\pi_\alpha = \sum_i \lambda_i^\alpha f(x s_i^\alpha) = \sum_i \lambda_i^\alpha (f * \delta_{s_i^\alpha})(x).$$

□

A key in the proof of amenability of a metric semigroup with Liouville property is the following proposition which describes the space $H_\pi(S)$ of harmonic functions on S as the fixed points $\{f \in LUC(S) : Pf = f\}$ of a left invariant Markov operator P on $LUC(S)$. This description gives grounds for a more general notion of *Liouville property* for semigroupoids defined later.

Proposition 2.10. *Let S be a metric semigroup and let $\pi \in M_t(S)$ be a probability measure. Then there exists a contractive projection $P : LUC(S) \to LUC(S)$ with range equal to $H_\pi(S)$. Moreover, P commutes with left translations on S.*

Proof. We follow similar arguments in [5] and [7] for the case of groups. Let $LUC(S)$ be equipped with the topology ρ of pointwise convergence and let the Cartesian product $LUC(S)^{LUC(S)}$ be equipped with the product topology. Define a linear map $L : LUC(S) \to LUC(S)$ by

$$L(f) = f * \pi \qquad (f \in LUC(S)).$$

Consider L as an element in $LUC(S)^{LUC(S)}$, and so are the n-th iterates $L^n = \overbrace{L \circ \cdots \circ L}^{\text{n−times}}$. By Lemma 2.9, we have $L^n \in \prod_{f \in LUC(S)} K_f \subseteq LUC(S)^{LUC(S)}$ for all n. It follows that the closed convex hull $K := \overline{\text{co}}\,\{L^n : n = 1, 2, \ldots\} \subseteq \prod_f K_f$ is compact in the product topology by Lemma 2.8.

Define an affine map $T : K \to K$ by

$$T(\Lambda)(f) = \Lambda(f) * \pi \qquad (\Lambda \in K, f \in LUC(S)).$$

Then T is continuous. Indeed, given a net $(\Lambda_\alpha)_\alpha$ in K converging to $\Lambda \in K$, then $\Lambda_\alpha(f) \longrightarrow \Lambda(f)$ pointwise on S for each $f \in LUC(S)$. By Lemma 2.9, $\Lambda(f), \Lambda_\alpha(f) \in K_f$ and hence Lemma 2.8 implies that $(\Lambda_\alpha(f))_\alpha$ converges to $\Lambda(f)$ uniformly on compact sets in S. It follows from direct computation that $(\Lambda_\alpha(f) * \pi)_\alpha$ converges pointwise to $\Lambda(f) * \pi$. This proves that $(T(\Lambda_\alpha))_\alpha$ converges to $T(\Lambda)$ in the product topology.

By the Markov-Kakutani fixed-point theorem, T admits a fixed point $P \in K$ which gives

$$P(f) = P(f) * \pi \qquad (f \in LUC(S)).$$

It is easy to see that $P^2 = P$ and $P(LUC(S)) = H_\pi(S)$. The last assertion follows from the fact that left translations on S commute with the operator L. □

Theorem 2.11. *Let S be a metric semigroup with the Liouville property for a tight probability measure π on S. Then S is amenable.*

Proof. Let $P : LUC(S) \to LUC(S)$ be the contractive projection constructed in Proposition 2.10. Since $P(LUC(S)) = H_\pi(S) = \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}$, we have

$$P(f) = \varphi(f)\mathbf{1} \qquad (f \in LUC(S))$$

for a unique functional $\varphi : LUC(S) \to \mathbb{C}$. Evidently, φ is a left invariant mean. □

If S is a σ-compact locally compact group, then the converse of Theorem 2.11 has been proven in [29]. It has also been proven in [16] if S is a countable discrete group. The proof depends on Reiter's condition for a locally compact group which is equivalent to amenability for groups. For

σ-compact metric semigroups, we now prove that Reiter's condition (as defined below) implies the Liouville property.

Definition 2.12. A topological semigroup S is said to satisfy *Reiter's condition* if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and compact set $K \subseteq S$, there is a probability measure θ on S with compact support such that $\|\theta - \delta_s * \theta\| < \varepsilon$ for all $s \in K$.

Proposition 2.13. *Let S be a σ-compact metric semigroup satisfying Reiter's condition. Then there is a tight probability measure π on S with $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|\delta_s * \pi^n - \pi^n\| = 0$ for all $s \in S$.*

Proof. Choose an increasing sequence $K_0 \subseteq K_1 \subseteq K_2 \subseteq \dots$ of compact subsets of S with $S = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} K_i$. Further, choose a sequence $(t_i)_i$ in $(0,1)$ with $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} t_i = 1$, and a strictly decreasing sequence $(\varepsilon_i)_i$ in $(0,1)$ with $\lim_{i\to\infty} \varepsilon_i = 0$. Also, let $(n_i)_i$ be an increasing sequence of natural numbers with $(t_1 + \dots + t_{i-1})^{n_i} < \varepsilon_i$.

We recursively choose probability measures θ_m on S with compact support and satisfying an approximate translation invariance condition. By assumption, there is a probability measure θ_1 on S with compact support such that $\|\theta_1 - \delta_s * \theta_1\| < \varepsilon_1$ for all $s \in K_0$. Assume $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{m-1}$ have been chosen. Let

$$\Theta_{m-1} := \left\{\theta_{k_1} * \dots * \theta_{k_j} \colon\ j = 1, \dots, n_m - 1;\ k_j = 1, \dots, m-1\right\}.$$

Then $\operatorname{supp} \Theta_{m-1} := \bigcup_{\rho\in\Theta_{m-1}} \operatorname{supp} \rho$ is compact. Now choose θ_m with compact support such that

$$\|\theta_m - \delta_s * \theta_m\| < \varepsilon_m \text{ for all } s \in K_{m-1} \cup \operatorname{supp} \Theta_{m-1} \cup (K_{m-1} \cdot \operatorname{supp} \Theta_{m-1}). \tag{1}$$

Set $\pi := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} t_i \theta_i$. Then $\pi \in M_t(S)$ since $\theta_i \in M_t(S)$ for all i.
Take $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \in K_{m-1}$. Let $n := n_m$. Write $\pi^n = \pi_1 + \pi_2$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1 &= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{N}^n \\ \max(\mathbf{k})<m}} t_{k_1} \cdots t_{k_n} \theta_{k_1} * \dots * \theta_{k_n}, \\ \pi_2 &= \pi^n - \pi_1 = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{N}^n \\ \max(\mathbf{k})\geq m}} t_{k_1} \cdots t_{k_n} \theta_{k_1} * \dots * \theta_{k_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\|\pi_1\| \leq (t_1 + \dots + t_{m-1})^{n_m} < \varepsilon_m$, and also $\|\delta_s * \pi_1\| < \varepsilon_m$. Therefore,

$$\|\pi_1 - \delta_s * \pi_1\| < 2\varepsilon_m. \tag{2}$$

For $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ with $\max(\mathbf{k}) \geq m$, $\theta_{k_1} * \dots * \theta_{k_n}$ is of the form $\theta * \tau$ for some $\theta = \theta_k$ with $k \geq m$, or it is of the form $\rho * \theta * \tau$ for some $\rho \in \Theta_{m-1}$ and $\theta = \theta_k$ with $k \geq m$. By (1), we have

$$\|\theta - \delta_s * \theta\| < \varepsilon_m. \tag{3}$$

Now let $\rho \in \Theta_{m-1}$. Take any $f \in C_b(S)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \theta - \rho * \theta, f\rangle| &= \left| \int_S f(y)d\theta(y) - \int_S \left(\int_{\mathrm{supp}\,(\rho)} f(xy)d\rho(x) \right) d\theta(y) \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{\mathrm{supp}\,(\rho)} \left(\int_S f(y)d\theta(y) - \int_S f(xy)d\theta(y) \right) d\rho(x) \right| \\ &\leq \int_{\mathrm{supp}\,(\rho)} |\langle \theta - \delta_x * \theta, f\rangle| \, d\rho(x) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathrm{supp}\,(\rho)} \|f\|_\infty \, \|\theta - \delta_x * \theta\| \, d\rho(x) \overset{(1)}{<} \|f\|_\infty \cdot \varepsilon_m \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\|\theta - \rho * \theta\| < \varepsilon_m$, and similarly $\|\theta - \delta_s * \rho * \theta\| < \varepsilon_m$. Thus

$$\|\rho * \theta - \delta_s * \rho * \theta\| < 2\varepsilon_m. \tag{4}$$

Hence, (3) and (4) imply $\|\theta * \tau - \delta_s * \theta * \tau\| < \varepsilon_m$ and $\|\rho * \theta * \tau - \delta_s * \rho * \theta * \tau\| < 2\varepsilon_m$. As every summand in π_2 is of the form $\theta * \tau$ or $\rho * \theta * \tau$, we obtain

$$\|\pi_2 - \delta_s * \pi_2\| < \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{N}^n \\ \max(\mathbf{k})\geq m}} t_{k_1} \cdots t_{k_n} \cdot 2\varepsilon_m \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} t_i \right)^n \cdot 2\varepsilon_m = 2\varepsilon_m. \tag{5}$$

Combining (2) and (5), we conclude that $\|\pi^i - \delta_s * \pi^i\| < 4\varepsilon_m$ for all $i \geq n$. This means that, indeed, for all $s \in S$, $\lim_{i\to\infty} \|\pi^i - \delta_s * \pi^i\| = 0$. □

Theorem 2.14. *Let S be a σ-compact metric semigroup with identity e satisfying Reiter's condition. Then S has the Liouville property for some tight probability measure.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.13, there is a tight probability measure π on S with

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|\delta_s * \pi^n - \pi^n\| = 0$$

for all $s \in S$. Hence for each π-harmonic function $f \in LUC(S)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f(x) - f(e)| &= |\textstyle\int_S (f(xy) - f(y))d\pi^n(y)| = |\int_S (\delta_x * f - f)d\pi^n| \\ &= |\textstyle\int_S f d(\delta_x * \pi^n - \pi^n)| \leq \|f\|_\infty \|\delta_x * \pi^n - \pi^n\| \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty \end{aligned}$$

and it follows that f is constant. This completes the proof. □

To recapitulate, we have shown that, for σ-compact metric semigroups, Reiter's condition implies the Liouville property, which in turn always implies amenability without the assumption of σ-compactness. It is not clear though whether amenability and Reiter's condition are equivalent for all semigroups. Certainly, Reiter's condition implies amenability because it yields a net $(\theta_i)_i$ of probability measures on S such that $\lim_i \|\theta_i - \delta_s * \theta_i\| = 0$ uniformly on compact subsets of S, and every w*-limit point of $(\theta_i)_i$ is a left invariant mean. However, we do not know whether the converse is true in general. This is only known in special cases, for instance for discrete semigroups (see § 8.3).

3. Semigroups with Liouville property

A measure on a semigroup is called *non-degenerate* if its support generates the semigroup. It is known that abelian semigroups have the Liouville property for non-degenerate probability measures (cf. [17, 25]). We now present a class of discrete non-abelian semigroups with identity and the Liouville property for non-degenerate probability measures.

Definition 3.1. Let S be a discrete semigroup with identity e. A *central series* of S is a finite chain

$$\{e\} = S_0 \subsetneq S_1 \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq S_n = S,$$

of subsemigroups in S such that

(i) S_m is *right reversible* for all $0 \leq m \leq n$, that is, for all x, y in S_m, we have $S_m x \cap S_m y \neq \emptyset$;
(ii) For every $1 \leq m \leq n$, $a \in S_m$ and $s \in S$, there exist x, y in S_{m-1} with $xas = ysa$.

We call n the *length* of the above central series.

Evidently, every abelian semigroup admits a central series of length 1.

Example 3.2. The Heisenberg semigroup

$$S = \left\{ \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & x & z \\ 0 & 1 & y \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \in GL_3(\mathbb{R}) \colon\ x, y, z \geq 0 \right\}$$

admits a central series of length 2.

To see this, set

$$S_0 = \left\{ \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \right\}, S_1 = \left\{ \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 & z \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \colon\ z \geq 0 \right\} \text{ and } S_2 = S.$$

Condition (i) is obviously satisfied for S_0 and S_1 (S_1 is abelian), and it holds for $S_2 = S$ as well because of

$$\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 & \zeta + x\eta \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & \xi & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \eta \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & x & z \\ 0 & 1 & y \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 & z + \xi y \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & x & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & y \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & \xi & \zeta \\ 0 & 1 & \eta \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$$

for all x, y, z and ξ, η, ζ.

Condition (ii) is true for $m = 1$ since S_1 is abelian. For $m = 2$, condition (ii) holds because we have for all x, y, z and ξ, η, ζ:

$$\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 & x\eta \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & \xi & \zeta \\ 0 & 1 & \eta \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & x & z \\ 0 & 1 & y \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 & \xi y \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & x & z \\ 0 & 1 & y \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & \xi & \zeta \\ 0 & 1 & \eta \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right).$$

Actually, exactly the same computations show that for every subring R of $\mathbb{R}$, the semigroup

$$S = \left\{ \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & x & z \\ 0 & 1 & y \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \in GL_3(\mathbb{R}) \colon\ x, y, z \in R \cap [0, \infty) \right\}$$

admits a central series of length 2.

Semigroups admitting central series are a natural generalisation of nilpotent groups. In the cancellative case, the relationship between such semigroups and nilpotent groups can be made precise.

Proposition 3.3. *Let S be a cancellative semigroup with identity. Then S admits a central series if and only if there exists a nilpotent group G (with identity e) with a finite chain*

$$\{e\} = G_0 \subsetneq G_1 \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq G_n = G$$

of normal subgroups such that for every $1 \leq m \leq n$, $g \in G$ *and* $g_m \in G_m$, *there exists* $g_{m-1} \in G_{m-1}$ *with* $gg_m = g_{m-1}g_m g$, *an embedding* $S \hookrightarrow G$ *such that for all* $0 \leq m \leq n$, $S_m := S \cap G_m$ *satisfies* $G_m = S_m^{-1}S_m$.

Proof. For "⇒", let $\{e\} = S_0 \subsetneq S_1 \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq S_n = S$ be a central series for S. Let G be the enveloping group of S. Since S is Ore (cancellative and right reversible) by assumption, we know that $G = S^{-1}S$. We set $G_m := S_m^{-1}S_m$. First, we show inductively on m that G_m is normal in G. The case $m = 0$ is trivial. To go from m to $m+1$, take $s \in S$ and $a, b \in S_m$. By assumption, there exist $x, y \in G_{m-1}$ with $xsa = as$ (and thus $sa^{-1} = a^{-1}xs$) and $ysb = bs$. Hence we have

$$sa^{-1}b = a^{-1}xsb = a^{-1}xy^{-1}bs \in G_m s$$

and therefore $sG_m \subseteq G_m s$. Moreover, by the inductive hypothesis, there exist $\xi, \eta \in G_{m-1}$ with

$$a^{-1}bs = a^{-1}ysb = a^{-1}s\eta b = a^{-1}s\xi\xi^{-1}\eta b = a^{-1}xs\xi^{-1}\eta b = sa^{-1}\xi^{-1}\eta b \in sG_m.$$

This shows $G_m s \subseteq sG_m$. We conclude that $sG_m = G_m s$, and also $s^{-1}G_m = G_m s^{-1}$. Using $G = S^{-1}S$, we deduce that G_m is normal in G.

This means that we may use calculations in the group of left (or right) cosets $G_{m-1}\backslash G = G/G_{m-1}$. Our goal is to show that $G_{m-1}\backslash G_m$ is central in $G_{m-1}\backslash G$. Since the semigroups S_m form a central series, we have for $s \in S$ and $a, b \in S_m$ that $sa = as$ (and thus $sa^{-1} = a^{-1}s$) and $sb = bs$ in $G_{m-1}\backslash G$. Therefore, $sa^{-1}b = a^{-1}bs$ in $G_{m-1}\backslash G$, i.e., for every $g_m \in G_m$, $sg_m = g_m s$ in $G_{m-1}\backslash G$. This implies $s^{-1}g_m = g_m s^{-1}$ in $G_{m-1}\backslash G$. Hence it follows that for all $s, t \in S$, $s^{-1}tg_m = g_m s^{-1}t$ in $G_{m-1}\backslash G$. So indeed, we have shown that $G_{m-1}\backslash G_m$ is central in $G_{m-1}\backslash G$.

Finally, set $\tilde{S}_m := S \cap G_m$. We obviously have $G_m = S_m^{-1}S_m \subseteq \tilde{S}_m^{-1}\tilde{S}_m \subseteq G_m$, and therefore $G_m = \tilde{S}_m^{-1}\tilde{S}_m$.

We now turn to "⇐". We claim that $S_m = S \cap G_m$ form a central series for S. To verify condition (i) in Definition 3.1, take $a, b \in S_m$. Since $G_m = S_m^{-1}S_m$, there exist $c, d \in S_m$ with $ab^{-1} = c^{-1}d$ and thus $ca = db$. We conclude that $S_m a \cap S_m b \neq \emptyset$. This shows that S_m is Ore. For condition (ii), let $s \in S$ and $a \in S_m$. Then by our assumption on the groups G_m, we can find $x, y \in S_{m-1}$ with $sa = x^{-1}yas$ and thus $xsa = yas$. This shows (ii) and the proof is complete. □

We are going to show that semigroups with a central series have the Liouville property. This is a generalisation of the corresponding result for nilpotent groups [10, 20]. To prove this, we follow the strategy of [6] (see also [20]). We begin with a lemma and the proof is similar to the one for groups given in [6].

Lemma 3.4. *Let* S *be a semigroup with identity* e *and* π *a non-degenerate probability measure on* S. *Then for each* $f \in H_\pi(S)$, *we have* $f(ax) = f(x)$ *for all* $x \in S$ *and* a *in the center of* S.

Proof. We may assume that f is real-valued, otherwise consider the real and imaginary parts of f separately.

Fix a in the center of S. Set $g(x) = f(x) - f(ax)$. Since $f \in \ell^\infty(S)$, we also have $g \in \ell^\infty(S)$. Let $\alpha := \sup_{x \in S} g(x)$. It is easy to see that $f \in H_\pi(S)$ implies $g \in H_\pi(S)$. Choose a sequence $(x_n)_n$ in S with $\alpha = \lim_{n\to\infty} g(x_n)$. Define $g_n \in \ell^\infty(S)$ by $g_n(x) := g(x_n x)$. Then $g_n \in H_\pi(S)$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} g_n(e) = \alpha$, where $g_n(x) = g(x_n x) \leq \alpha$ for all $x \in S$. We also know that $\|g_n\|_\infty \leq \|g\|_\infty$. Let h be a w*-limit point of g_n in $\ell^\infty(S)$. Since $g_n \in H_\pi(S)$ and the

map $\varphi \in \ell^\infty(S) \mapsto \varphi * \pi \in \ell^\infty(S)$ is w*-continuous, we have $h = h * \pi$ in $\ell^\infty(S)$ and therefore $h \in H_\pi(S)$. As w*-convergence in $\ell^\infty(S)$ implies pointwise convergence, $g_n(x) \leq \alpha$ implies $h(x) \leq \alpha$ for all $x \in S$. Since $\lim_{n\to\infty} g_n(e) = \alpha$, we have $h(e) = \alpha$.

We show $h(a) = \alpha$. For this, choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\pi^n(a) > 0$. Such a natural number n exists because by assumption, $S = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty (\operatorname{supp}\pi)^n = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \operatorname{supp}\pi^n$. If $h(a) < \alpha$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha = h(e) = h * \pi^n(e) &= \sum_{y\in S} h(y)\pi^n(y) = h(a)\pi^n(a) + \sum_{y\neq a} h(y)\pi^n(y) \\ < \quad \alpha\pi^n(a) + \sum_{y\neq a} \alpha\pi^n(y) &= \alpha \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Hence we must have $h(a) = \alpha$. Similarly, $h(a^p) = \alpha$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$.

Now if $\alpha > 0$, then we can choose $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\|f\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{4}m\alpha$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $g_n(a^p) > \frac{1}{2}\alpha$ for all $1 \leq p \leq m$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \tfrac{1}{2}m\alpha < \sum_{p=1}^m g_n(a^p) &= \sum_{p=1}^m f(x_n a^p) - f(a x_n a^p) = \sum_{p=1}^m f(x_n a^p) - f(x_n a^{p+1}) \\ = \quad f(x_n a) - f(x_n a^{p+1}) &\leq 2 \cdot \tfrac{1}{4}m\alpha = \tfrac{1}{2}m\alpha \end{aligned}$$

which is impossible. Therefore $\alpha \leq 0$ and we have $g(x) \leq 0$ for all $x \in S$, that is, $f(x) \leq f(ax)$ for $x \in S$. Now repeat the above argument for the function $f(ax) - f(x)$ to obtain $f(ax) \leq f(x)$ for all $x \in S$. Hence we conclude $f(x) = f(ax)$ for all $x \in S$. □

Theorem 3.5. *Let S be a semigroup with identity and a central series. Then for every non-degenerate probability measure π on S, we have $H_\pi(S) = \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}$.*

Proof. We proceed inductively on the length n of the central series of S. The case $n = 0$ is trivial. For the inductive step, assume the assertion is true for length n and let

$$\{e\} = S_0 \subsetneq S_1 \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq S_n \subseteq S_{n+1} = S$$

be a central series of length $n+1$. We define an equivalence relation $\sim$ on S by setting $x \sim y$ if there exist $a, b \in S_1$ such that $ax = by$. It is obvious that $\sim$ is indeed an equivalence relation (for reflexivity, use that S has a identity which lies in S_1, and for transitivity, use that S_1 is abelian, hence right reversible). Furthermore, the set $S/_\sim$ of equivalence classes $\dot{x}$ carries a natural semigroup structure induced by S: define $\dot{x} \cdot \dot{y} := \dot{(xy)}$. This is well-defined because S_1 is in the center of S. It is easy to see that

$$\{\dot{e}\} = S_1/_\sim \subsetneq S_2/_\sim \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq S_n/_\sim \subseteq S_{n+1}/_\sim = S/_\sim$$

is a central series of length at most n for $S/_\sim$.

Now let π be a probability measure on S such that $\operatorname{supp}\pi$ generates S as a semigroup. Let $q : S \to S/_\sim$ be the quotient map. Define a probability measure $\dot{\pi}$ on $S/_\sim$ by setting $\dot{\pi}(\dot{x}) := \sum_{x\in q^{-1}(\dot{x})} \pi(x)$. By construction, if $\pi(x) > 0$, then $\dot{\pi}(\dot{x}) > 0$. Therefore, $\operatorname{supp}\dot{\pi}$ generates $S/_\sim$ as a semigroup. By the inductive hypothesis, we have $H_{\dot{\pi}}(S/_\sim) = \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}$.

Let $f \in H_\pi(S)$. Define $\dot{f} : S/_\sim \to \mathbb{C}$ by $\dot{f}(\dot{x}) := f(x)$. This is well-defined. Indeed, if $x \sim y$, then there exist $a, b \in S_1$ with $ax = by$. As S_1 is contained in the center of S, Proposition 3.4

yields $f(x) = f(ax) = f(by) = f(y)$. The following computation

$$(\dot{f} * \dot{\pi})(\dot{x}) = \sum_{\dot{y} \in S/_\sim} \dot{f}(\dot{x}\dot{y})\dot{\pi}(\dot{y}) = \sum_{\dot{y} \in S/_\sim} f(xy) \sum_{y \in q^{-1}(y)} \pi(y) = \sum_{y \in S} f(xy)\pi(y) = f(x) = \dot{f}(\dot{x})$$

shows $\dot{f} \in H_{\dot{\pi}}(S/_\sim)$. Hence $\dot{f}$ must be constant and f must be constant as well. □

4. Semigroupoids

We are now ready to study the relationship between Reiter's condition and the Liouville property for semigroupoids. We do so in the measurable and topological setting. Semigroupoids generalise groupoids and semigroups at the same time, in a very natural way.

A semigroupoid is a small category. It consists of a set $\mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ of objects (called units), a set $\mathcal{G}$ of morphisms, the surjective *source* and *target* maps $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t} : \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$, and a composition map $(\zeta, \eta) \in \mathcal{G}^{(2)} \mapsto \zeta\eta \in \mathcal{G}$ on $\mathcal{G}^{(2)} := \{(\zeta, \eta) \in \mathcal{G}^2 \colon \mathbf{s}(\zeta) = \mathbf{t}(\eta)\}$. As usual, we identify the units with the corresponding identity morphisms in $\mathcal{G}$ (which exist by definition). In this way, we may view $\mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ as a subset of $\mathcal{G}$. Moreover, for $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$, we write $\mathcal{G}^x := \mathbf{t}^{-1}(x) = \{\gamma \in \mathcal{G} \colon \mathbf{t}(\gamma) = x\}$.

A semigroupoid $\mathcal{G}$ is called *Borel* if $\mathcal{G}$ is an analytic Borel space (see § 2), $\mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ is an analytic Borel space (as a subspace of $\mathcal{G}$) such that $\mathbf{s}$, $\mathbf{t}$ and the composition map are Borel. In this case, the sets $\mathcal{G}^x$ and the maps $\zeta : \eta \in \mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)} \mapsto \zeta\eta \in \mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{t}(\zeta)}$ are Borel. We call $\mathcal{G}$ a *topological semigroupoid* if it is endowed with a topology compatible with the semigroupoid structure, that is, the composition map, $\mathbf{s}$ and $\mathbf{t}$ are continuous. By a *locally compact semigroupoid*, we mean a topological semigroupoid which is locally compact Hausdorff and second countable. This implies that all our locally compact semigroupoids are σ-compact.

Example 4.1. Groupoids, which are by definition small categories with invertible morphisms, form a special class of semigroupoids. We refer the reader to [26] for more information about groupoids.

Another class of examples is given by semigroups, or more generally, semigroup actions. Let S be a semigroup with identity e acting on a set X from the right. We denote the action by $(x, s) \in X \times S \mapsto x.s \in X$, where $x.e = x$. The semigroupoid attached to the transformation semigroup $X \curvearrowleft S$ is given by $\mathcal{G} := X \rtimes S := X \times S$ (as a set), with the source and target maps $\mathbf{s} : (x, s) \in X \rtimes S \mapsto x.s \in X$, $\mathbf{t} : (x, s) \in X \rtimes S \mapsto x \in X$, and the composition $(x, s)(x.s, t) = (x, st)$. It is clear that the set $\mathcal{G}^{(0)} = \{(x, e) \colon x \in X\}$ of units of $X \rtimes S$ can be canonically identified with X. If X and S are analytic Borel spaces, or topological spaces, such that $\mathbf{s}$, $\mathbf{t}$ and the composition map are Borel or continuous respectively, then $X \rtimes S$ becomes a Borel or topological semigroupoid. In particular, this is the case if S is a countable discrete semigroup acting on a Borel space or a topological space by Borel or continuous maps respectively.

Groupoids and transformation semigroups are the two motivating examples for us. We will frequently come back to them.

Definition 4.2. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a Borel semigroupoid. A *Borel system of measures* on $\mathcal{G}$ is a family $\lambda = (\lambda^x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ of (nonzero) σ-finite Borel measures λ^x on $\mathcal{G}^x$ such that for every non-negative Borel function f on $\mathcal{G}$, the map $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)} \mapsto \langle \lambda^x, f \rangle := \int_{\mathcal{G}} f d\lambda^x \in \mathbb{R}$ is Borel, where we extend λ^x naturally to a measure on $\mathcal{G}$ with $\lambda^x(\mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{G}^x) = 0$.

Definition 4.3. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a topological semigroupoid. A *continuous system of measures* on $\mathcal{G}$ is a family $\lambda = (\lambda^x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ of (nonzero) σ-finite Radon measures λ^x on $\mathcal{G}^x$ such that for every $f \in C_c(\mathcal{G})$, the map $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)} \mapsto \langle \lambda^x, f\rangle \in \mathbb{C}$ is continuous.

Given a Borel semigroupoid $\mathcal{G}$, elements $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$ with $\mathbf{s}(\gamma) = x$, and a Borel measure λ^x on $\mathcal{G}^x$, we write $\gamma\lambda^x$ for the pushforward of λ^x under the Borel map $\gamma : \eta \in \mathcal{G}^x \mapsto \gamma\eta \in \mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}$, which is the Borel measure on $\mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}$ induced by the map γ. By definition, we have

$$\langle \gamma\lambda^x, f\rangle = \int_{\mathcal{G}^x} f(\gamma\eta)d\lambda^x(\eta) \qquad (f \in B_b(\mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}))$$

where B_b stands for the algebra of bounded complex-valued Borel functions.

For a locally compact semigroupoid $\mathcal{G}$, the pushforward $\gamma\lambda^x$ is defined analogously. As usual, we write $\mu \prec \nu$ to mean that a measure μ is absolutely continuous with respect to ν.

Definition 4.4. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a Borel (resp. topological) semigroupoid. A Borel (resp. continuous) system of measures $\lambda = (\lambda^x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ on $\mathcal{G}$ is called a *(left) quasi-Haar system* if for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$, we have $\gamma\lambda^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)} \prec \lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}$ and the map $(\gamma, \eta) \in \mathcal{G}^2 \mapsto \left(d(\gamma\lambda^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)})/d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}\right)(\eta) \in \mathbb{C}$ is Borel, where $d(\gamma\lambda^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)})/d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}$ denotes the Radon-Nikodym derivative.

Definition 4.5. A Borel system of measures $\lambda = (\lambda^x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ on a Borel semigroupoid $\mathcal{G}$ is called *proper* if there exists an increasing sequence of Borel subsets A_n of $\mathcal{G}$ with $\mathcal{G} = \bigcup_n A_n$ such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the map $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)} \mapsto \lambda^x(A_n) \in \mathbb{R}$ is bounded.

Definition 4.6. A *measure semigroupoid* is a triple $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda, \mu)$ consisting of a Borel semigroupoid $\mathcal{G}$, a proper quasi-Haar system $\lambda = (\lambda^x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ on $\mathcal{G}$ and a Borel measure μ on $\mathcal{G}^{(0)}$.

In the topological setting, we shall denote by $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda)$ a locally compact semigroupoid $\mathcal{G}$ equipped with a quasi-Haar system $\lambda = (\lambda^x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ on $\mathcal{G}$.

Remark 4.7. If λ is a left Haar system on a Borel (or locally compact) groupoid, then λ is a quasi-Haar system since $\gamma\lambda^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)} = \lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}$. An important example of a measure semigroupoid is the *measured groupoid* $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda, \mu)$ studied in [1, 15] in which the Borel system λ is assumed to be a left Haar system. Likewise, a continuous system λ of measures on a locally compact groupoid $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda)$ considered in [1, 15] is always a left Haar system. Our notion of a quasi-Haar system is only a weaker version of a Haar system in the groupoid case. However, it turns out that this weak version is already sufficient for our purpose.

Let us now consider the case of the Borel semigroupoid $X \rtimes S$ attached to a Borel transformation semigroup $X \curvearrowleft S$. Let λ be a nonzero Borel measure on S satisfying $s\lambda \prec \lambda$ for all $s \in S$, where $s\lambda$ is the left translation of λ, which is the measure induced by the translation $t \in S \mapsto st \in S$. Suppose that the map $(s, t) \in S \times S \mapsto (d(s\lambda)/d\lambda)(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ is Borel. Then $\lambda^x := \delta_x \times \lambda$ is a quasi-Haar system on $X \rtimes S$ as $(x, s)(\delta_{x.s} \times \lambda) = \delta_x \times (s\lambda)$. Here is a concrete class of examples: Suppose that G is a locally compact group, acting on an analytic Borel space X with a Borel action $(x, g) \in X \times G \mapsto x.g \in X$. Let λ_G be the Haar measure on G. If S is a Borel subsemigroup of G containing the identity such that $\lambda_G(S) \neq 0$, then the restriction λ of λ_G to S satisfies $s\lambda \prec \lambda$ for all $s \in S$ and $(d(s\lambda)/d\lambda)(t) = \chi_S(s^{-1}t)$. Therefore $\lambda^x := \delta_x \times \lambda$ gives rise to a quasi-Haar system on $X \rtimes S$. In particular, if $X = \{\mathrm{pt}\}$, this allows us to view

the semigroup $S \cong \{\mathrm{pt}\} \rtimes S$ as a measure semigroupoid. Of course, another class of examples is given by the case when S is discrete (and countable) and λ is the counting measure.

4.1. **Reiter's condition.**

Definition 4.8. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a Borel (resp. topological) semigroupoid, and λ a quasi-Haar system on $\mathcal{G}$. A Borel (resp. continuous) system $\theta = (\theta^x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ of probability measures on $\mathcal{G}^x$ is called λ-*adapted* if

$$\theta^x \prec \lambda^x \text{ for every } x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}, \quad \text{and the map} \quad (\gamma,\eta) \in \mathcal{G}^2 \mapsto \frac{d(\gamma\theta^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)})}{d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}}(\eta) \in \mathbb{R} \text{ is Borel.} \tag{6}$$

Note that absolute continuity in (6) and Definition 4.4 imply that $\gamma\theta_n^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)} \prec \gamma\lambda^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)} \prec \lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}$ and we may consider the Radon-Nikodym derivative in (6).

Given a measured semigroupoid $(\mathcal{G},\lambda,\mu)$, we let $\lambda * \mu$ be the Borel measure on $\mathcal{G}$ given by

$$\langle \lambda * \mu, f\rangle := \int_{\mathcal{G}} f d(\lambda * \mu) := \int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} f d\lambda^x \right) d\mu(x) \qquad \text{for all } f \in B_b(\mathcal{G}).$$

Definition 4.9. A measure semigroupoid $(\mathcal{G},\lambda,\mu)$ is said to satisfy *Reiter's condition*, or called *Reiter*, if there exists a sequence $(\theta_n)_n$ of λ-adapted Borel systems of probability measures $\theta_n = (\theta_n^x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathcal{G}} \left\| \theta_n^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\theta_n^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)} \right\| f(\gamma) d(\lambda * \mu)(\gamma) = 0 \text{ for all } f \in L^1(\mathcal{G}, \lambda * \mu). \tag{7}$$

Remark 4.10. We observe that $\|\theta_n^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\theta_n^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\| \le 2$ and by the Lebesgue convergence theorem, the following condition implies (7):

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left\| \theta_n^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\theta_n^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)} \right\| = 0 \text{ for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)} \text{ and } \lambda^x\text{-a.e. } \gamma \in \mathcal{G}^x. \tag{8}$$

Given a continuous system of measures $\theta = (\theta^x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ on a locally compact semigroupoid $\mathcal{G}$ and a compact subset $K \subseteq \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$, we set $\mathrm{supp}_K\theta := \overline{\bigcup_{x\in K} \mathrm{supp}\, \theta^x}$.

Definition 4.11. A locally compact semigroupoid with quasi-Haar system $(\mathcal{G},\lambda)$ is said to satisfy *Reiter's condition* if there exists a sequence $(\theta_n)_n$ of λ-adapted continuous systems of probability measures $\theta_n = (\theta_n^x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left\| \theta_n^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\theta_n^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)} \right\| = 0 \text{ for all } \gamma \in \mathcal{G}. \tag{9}$$

We say that $(\mathcal{G},\lambda)$ satisfies the *uniform Reiter's condition* if the convergence in (9) is uniform on compact subsets of $\mathcal{G}$.

If for every compact subset K of $\mathcal{G}^{(0)}$, the support $\mathrm{supp}_K(\theta_n)$ is compact for each θ_n in (9), we say that $(\mathcal{G},\lambda)$ satisfies the *tight Reiter's condition*.

We also call $(\mathcal{G},\lambda)$ *Reiter* (respectively, *uniform Reiter* or *tight Reiter*) if it satisfies Reiter's condition (respectively, the uniform Reiter's condition or the tight Reiter's condition).

Remark 4.12. A measured groupoid $(\mathcal{G},\lambda,\mu)$, where λ is a left Haar system, is Reiter in our sense if and only if it is amenable (see [1, Chapter 3]). A locally compact groupoid $(\mathcal{G},\lambda)$, where

λ is a left Haar system, is uniform Reiter in our sense if and only if $\mathcal{G}$ is amenable (see [1, Chapter 2]). Moreover, by [27, Theorem 2.14], we know that in the case of locally compact groupoids, $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda)$ is Reiter if and only if it is uniform Reiter. We will see later that for such groupoids, Reiter's condition is also equivalent to the tight Reiter's condition.

Let us now consider the case of the semigroupoid $X \rtimes S$ attached to a transformation semigroup $X \curvearrowleft S$, where S is a countable discrete semigroup. For our quasi-Haar system, we always choose $\lambda^x = \delta_x \times \lambda$, where λ is the counting measure. Going through our definitions, we see that in the Borel case, $(X \rtimes S, \lambda, \mu)$ is Reiter if there exists a sequence $(\theta_n)_n$ of families $\theta_n = (\theta_n^x)_{x \in X}$ of probability measures θ_n^x on S such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \in S$, the map $x \in X \mapsto \theta_n^x(s) \in \mathbb{R}$ is Borel, and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_X \sum_{s\in S} \|\theta_n^x - s\theta_n^{x.s}\| \, f(x,s) d\mu(x) = 0$ for all $f \in L^1(X \times S, \mu \times \lambda)$. In the locally compact case, our definition says that $(X \rtimes S, \lambda)$ is Reiter if there exists a sequence $(\theta_n)_n$ of families $\theta_n = (\theta_n^x)_{x \in X}$ of probability measures θ_n^x on S such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the map $x \in X \mapsto \theta_n^x \in \ell^1(S)$ is continuous, and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|\theta_n^x - s\theta_n^{x.s}\| = 0$ for all $x \in X$ and $s \in S$. If the convergence is uniform on compact subsets of X, then $(X \rtimes S, \lambda)$ is uniform Reiter, and if $\mathrm{supp}_K \theta_n := \bigcup_{x\in K} \mathrm{supp}\, \theta_n^x \subseteq S$ is finite for every compact subset K of X, then $(X \rtimes S, \lambda)$ is tight Reiter.

4.2. **The Liouville property.** Let $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda, \mu)$ be a measure semigroupoid and $\pi = (\pi_x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ a Borel system of probability measures. For each $f \in B_b(\mathcal{G})$, the map $\zeta \in \mathcal{G} \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{G}} f(\zeta\eta) d\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)}(\eta) \in \mathbb{C}$ is Borel. Therefore we can define, for every $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$, a Borel measure $\lambda^x P_x$ on $\mathcal{G}^x$ by

$$\langle \lambda^x P_x, f \rangle := \int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}} f(\zeta\eta) d\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)}(\eta) \right) d\lambda^x(\zeta)$$

for all $f \in B_b(\mathcal{G})$. Given $\pi_x \prec \lambda^x$ for all $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$, we can define, for every $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$, the *fibrewise Markov operator* $P_x : L^\infty(\mathcal{G}^x, \lambda^x) \to L^\infty(\mathcal{G}^x, \lambda^x)$ by

$$P_x(f)(\zeta) = \int_{\mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)}} f(\zeta\eta) d\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)}(\eta) \qquad (\zeta \in \mathcal{G}^x).$$

Let $H_{\pi,x}(\mathcal{G}) := \{f \in L^\infty(\mathcal{G}^x, \lambda^x) \colon P_x(f) = f\}$ be the space of bounded P_x-*harmonic functions* on the fibre $\mathcal{G}^x$.

For a locally compact semigroupid $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda)$ with a λ-adapted continuous system π of probability measures, the space $H_{\pi,x}(\mathcal{G})$ is defined analogously.

Example 4.13. In the case of the semigroupoid $X \rtimes S$ attached to a transformation semigroup $X \curvearrowleft S$, where S is a discrete semigroup, the fibrewise Markov operator $P_x : \ell^\infty(S) \to \ell^\infty(S)$ is given by $P_x(f)(r) = \sum_{s\in S} f(rs)\pi_{x.r}(s)$.

Definition 4.14. A measure semigroupoid $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda, \mu)$ is said to have the *Liouville property*, or called *Liouville*, if there exists a λ-adapted Borel system of probability measures $\pi = (\pi_x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ such that $H_{\pi,x}(\mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}$ for μ-a.e. $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$.

Definition 4.15. A locally compact semigroupoid $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda)$ with quasi-Haar system is said to have the *Liouville property*, or called *Liouville*, if there exists a λ-adapted continuous system of probability measures $\pi = (\pi_x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ such that $H_{\pi,x}(\mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$.

We say that $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda)$ has the *continuous Liouville property*, or is *continuous Liouville*, if the system π above also satisfies the condition that the map $(\gamma, \eta) \in \mathcal{G}^2 \mapsto \left(d(\gamma\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)})/d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}\right)(\eta) \in \mathbb{R}$ is bounded and continuous.

The semigroupoid $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda)$ is said to have the *tight Liouville property* or called *tight Liouville*, if it is Liouville with the system π satisfying the condition that for every compact subset K of $\mathcal{G}^{(0)}$, $\mathrm{supp}_K(\pi)$ is compact.

For groupoids, these definitions coincide with the ones given in [15].

5. Convolution of systems of measures

We now define the convolution of two systems of measures on semigroupoids. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a Borel semigroupoid and $\pi = (\pi_x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ a Borel system of probability measures on $\mathcal{G}$. Given a Borel measure ρ on $\mathcal{G}^x$ for some $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$, we first define the convolution $\rho * \pi$ of ρ with the system π as the following Borel measure on $\mathcal{G}^x$:

$$\langle \rho * \pi, f\rangle := \int_{\mathcal{G}^x} f d(\rho * \pi) := \int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)}} f(\zeta\eta) d\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)}(\eta) \right) d\rho(\zeta).$$

Now for a Borel system $\rho = (\rho_x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ of measures on $\mathcal{G}$, we define $(\rho * \pi)_x := \rho_x * \pi$ and write $\rho * \pi = ((\rho * \pi)_x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ for the family of Borel measures $(\rho * \pi)_x$ on $\mathcal{G}^x$.

For a locally compact semigroupoid $\mathcal{G}$ and a continuous system π of probability measures on $\mathcal{G}$, one can define analogously the convolution $\rho * \pi$ for a Borel measure ρ on some $\mathcal{G}^x$.

Remark 5.1. The Borel measure $\lambda^x P_x$ defined in § 4.2 is just the convolution $\lambda^x P_x = \lambda^x * \pi = (\lambda * \pi)_x$.

In the case of the semigroupoid $X \rtimes S$ attached to a transformation semigroup $X \curvearrowleft S$, where S is a discrete semigroup, the convolution $\rho * \pi$ is given by $(\rho * \pi)(t) = \sum_{\substack{r,s\in S\\ rs=t}} \pi_{x.r}(s)\rho(r)$.

We collect below some simple facts about convolutions of measures for later use.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a Borel semigroupoid and $\pi = (\pi_x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ a Borel system of probability measures in* a) *and* b) *below.*

a) *If $\lambda = (\lambda^x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ is a quasi-Haar system on $\mathcal{G}$ with $\pi_y \prec \lambda^y$ for all $y \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$, then for every $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ and every Borel measure ρ on $\mathcal{G}^x$, we have $\rho * \pi \prec \lambda^x$.*

b) *If $\rho = (\rho_x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ is a Borel system of probability measures on $\mathcal{G}$, then $\rho * \pi$ is a Borel system of probability measures on $\mathcal{G}$.*

c) *If $\mathcal{G}$ is a locally compact semigroupoid, and if π and $\rho = (\rho_x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ are continuous systems of probability measures on $\mathcal{G}$, then $\rho * \pi$ is a continuous system of probability measures.*

d) *If $\mathcal{G}$ is a locally compact semigroupoid, if π and $\rho = (\rho_x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ are continuous systems of probability measures on $\mathcal{G}$, and if π and ρ have the property that for every compact subset $K \subseteq \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$, $\mathrm{supp}_K(\pi)$ and $\mathrm{supp}_K(\rho)$ are compact, then $\rho * \pi$ has this property as well.*

e) *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a Borel semigroupoid with a quasi-Haar system $\lambda = (\lambda^x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ and a Borel system π as in* a). *If $\rho = (\rho_x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ is a Borel system of probability measures on $\mathcal{G}$ satisfying $\rho_x \prec \lambda^x$ for all $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$, and if both maps $(\gamma, \eta) \in \mathcal{G}^2 \mapsto \left(d(\gamma\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)})/d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}\right)(\eta) \in \mathbb{R}$ and $(\gamma, \eta) \in \mathcal{G}^2 \mapsto \left(d(\gamma\rho_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)})/d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}\right)(\eta) \in \mathbb{R}$ are Borel, then so is the map $(\gamma, \eta) \in \mathcal{G}^2 \mapsto \left(d(\gamma(\rho * \pi)_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)})/d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}\right)(\eta) \in \mathbb{R}$.*

f) *Suppose that $(\mathcal{G},\lambda)$ is a locally compact semigroupoid with quasi-Haar system, and that π and $\rho=(\rho_x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ are continuous systems of probability measures on $\mathcal{G}$. If $\pi_x\prec\lambda^x$ and $\rho_x\prec\lambda^x$ for all $x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}$, and if both maps $(\gamma,\eta)\in\mathcal{G}^2\mapsto\left(d(\gamma\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)})/d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}\right)(\eta)\in\mathbb{R}$ and $(\gamma,\eta)\in\mathcal{G}^2\to\mapsto\left(d(\gamma\rho_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)})/d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}\right)(\eta)\in\mathbb{R}$ are bounded and continuous, then also the map $(\gamma,\eta)\in\mathcal{G}^2\mapsto\left(d(\gamma(\rho*\pi)_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)})/d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}\right)(\eta)\in\mathbb{R}$ is bounded and continuous.*

For a Borel or a locally compact semigroupoid $\mathcal{G}$, the following assertions hold.

g) *If ρ is a Borel measure on $\mathcal{G}^x$ for some $x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}$, then $\|\rho*\pi\|\leq\|\rho\|$.*
h) *If ρ is a probability measure on $\mathcal{G}^x$ ($x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}$), then $\|\pi_x-\rho*\pi\|\leq\int_{\mathcal{G}^x}\left\|\pi_x-\zeta\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)}\right\|d\rho(\zeta)$.*

Proof.

a) This follows from $\langle\rho*\pi,f\rangle=\int_{\mathcal{G}^x}\left(\int_{\mathcal{G}}fd(\zeta\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)})\right)d\rho(\zeta)$ and $\zeta\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)}\prec\zeta\lambda^{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)}\prec\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\zeta)}=\lambda^x$.
b) Given $f\in B_b(\mathcal{G})$, it is easy to see that the map $\mathcal{G}\to\mathbb{C}$, $\zeta\mapsto\left\langle\zeta\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)},f\right\rangle$ is Borel. Thus $\mathcal{G}^{(0)}\to\mathbb{C}$, $x\mapsto\int_{\mathcal{G}^x}\left\langle\zeta\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)},f\right\rangle d\rho^x(\zeta)$ is Borel because ρ is a Borel system of measures.
c) First of all, since $\mathcal{G}$ is locally compact and second countable, we know that $\mathcal{G}^{(0)}\to\mathbb{C}$, $x\mapsto\langle\pi_x,f\rangle$ is continuous for every $f\in C_b(\mathcal{G})$ (not only for $f\in C_c(\mathcal{G})$), and similarly for ρ. A similar argument as in the proof of [22, Chapter III, Lemma 1.1] shows that for every $f\in C_b(\mathcal{G})$, the map $\mathcal{G}\to\mathbb{C}$, $\zeta\mapsto\left\langle\zeta\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)},f\right\rangle$ is continuous (and obviously bounded, too). Hence, since ρ is a continuous system of measures, we conclude that $\mathcal{G}^{(0)}\to\mathbb{C}$, $x\mapsto\langle(\rho*\pi)_x,f\rangle=\int_{\mathcal{G}^x}\left\langle\zeta\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)},f\right\rangle d\rho_x(\zeta)$ is continuous.
d) Given two subsets A and B of $\mathcal{G}$, we write $A\cdot B$ for the image $(A\times B)\cap\mathcal{G}^{(2)}$ under $\times:\mathcal{G}^{(2)}\to\mathcal{G}$. Obviously, $A\cdot B$ is compact if both A and B are compact. Now given a compact subset K of $\mathcal{G}^{(0)}$, it is obvious that $\mathrm{supp}_K(\rho*\pi)\subseteq\mathrm{supp}_K(\rho)\cdot\mathrm{supp}_K(\pi)$.
e) Let $u_\gamma:=d(\gamma\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)})/d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}$ and $v_\gamma:=d(\gamma\rho_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)})/d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}$. Then for $f\in B_b(\mathcal{G})$ and $\gamma\in\mathcal{G}$ with $\mathbf{s}(\gamma)=x$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\gamma(\rho*\pi)_x,f\rangle &= \int_{\mathcal{G}^x}\left(\int_{\mathcal{G}}f(\gamma\zeta\eta)d\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)}(\eta)\right)d\rho_x(\zeta)=\int_{\mathcal{G}}\left(\int_{\mathcal{G}}f(\xi\eta)d\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\xi)}(\eta)\right)d(\gamma\rho_x)(\xi)\\ &= \int_{\mathcal{G}}\left(\int_{\mathcal{G}}fd(\xi\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\xi)})\right)d(\gamma\rho_x)(\xi)=\int_{\mathcal{G}}\left(\int_{\mathcal{G}}fu_\xi d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\xi)}\right)v_\gamma(\xi)d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}(\xi)\\ &= \int_{\mathcal{G}}f(\omega)\left(\int_{\mathcal{G}}u_\xi(\omega)v_\gamma(\xi)d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}(\xi)\right)d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}(\omega).\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have $\left(d(\gamma(\rho*\pi)_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)})/d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}\right)(\omega)=\int_{\mathcal{G}}u_\xi(\omega)v_\gamma(\xi)d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}(\xi)$. It follows that the map $(\gamma,\omega)\in\mathcal{G}^2\mapsto\left(d(\gamma(\rho*\pi)_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)})/d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}\right)(\omega)\in\mathbb{R}$ is Borel.
f) This follows from the same computation as in the proof of e) and a similar argument as in the proof of [22, Chapter III, Lemma 1.1].
g) Given $f\in B_b(\mathcal{G})$, the map $f_\pi:\mathcal{G}\to\mathbb{C}$, $\zeta\mapsto\int_{\mathcal{G}}f(\zeta\eta)d\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)}(\eta)$ is a bounded Borel function, with $\|f_\pi\|_\infty\leq\|f\|_\infty$. Hence $|\langle\rho*\pi,f\rangle|=|\langle\rho,f_\pi\rangle|\leq\|\rho\|\cdot\|f_\pi\|_\infty\leq\|\rho\|\cdot\|f\|_\infty$. Our claim follows.

h) For $\varepsilon > 0$, let $f \in B_b(\mathcal{G})$ satisfy $\|f\|_\infty = 1$ and $|\langle \pi_x - \rho * \pi, f\rangle| \geq \|\pi_x - \rho * \pi\| - \varepsilon$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\pi_x - \rho * \pi\| &\leq \varepsilon + \left| \int_{\mathcal{G}} f(\eta) d\pi_x(\eta) - \int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}} f(\zeta\eta) d\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)}(\eta) \right) d\rho(\zeta) \right| \\
&= \varepsilon + \left| \int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}} f(\eta) d\pi_x(\eta) - \int_{\mathcal{G}} f(\zeta\eta) d\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)}(\eta) \right) d\rho(\zeta) \right| \\
&\leq \varepsilon + \int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left| \int_{\mathcal{G}} f(\eta) d\pi_x(\eta) - \int_{\mathcal{G}} f(\zeta\eta) d\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)}(\eta) \right| d\rho(\zeta) \\
&\leq \varepsilon + \int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left\| \pi_x - \zeta \pi_{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)} \right\| d\rho(\zeta).
\end{aligned}$$

Since ε is arbitrary, our claim follows.

□

6. Liouville property implies Reiter's condition

Our goal now is to prove that for semigroupoids, the Liouville property implies Reiter's condition. This generalises two results of Kaimanovich (Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 6.1 in [15]). We first establish the connection between our setting and the one in [15, § 3].

Let $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda, \mu)$ be a measure semigroupoid and $\pi = (\pi_x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ a λ-adapted Borel system of probability measures on $\mathcal{G}$. We observe that, for every $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$, the fibrewise Markov operator $P_x : L^\infty(\mathcal{G}^x, \lambda_x) \to L^\infty(\mathcal{G}^x, \lambda_x)$ has a predual operator given by $\theta \in L^1(\mathcal{G}^x, \lambda_x) \mapsto \theta P_x := \theta * \pi \in L^1(\mathcal{G}^x, \lambda_x)$ since

$$\langle \theta, P_x(f)\rangle = \int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}} f(\zeta\eta) d\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)}(\eta) \right) d\theta(\zeta) = \langle \theta * \pi, f\rangle \qquad (f \in L^\infty(\mathcal{G}^x, \lambda_x))$$

(cf. [15, § 3]). We have the k-th iterate $\theta P_x^k = \theta * \pi^k$.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda, \mu)$ be a measure semigroupoid. If $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda, \mu)$ is Liouville, then it is Reiter.*

Proof. Let $\pi = (\pi_x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ be a λ-adapted Borel system of probability measures such that $H_{\pi,x}(\mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}$ for μ-a.e. $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$. Moreover, let $\theta = (\theta^x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ be any λ-adapted Borel system of probability measures. For instance, we could take $\theta^x = \pi_x$. Set $\theta_n^x := \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k=0}^n \theta^x * \pi^k$. This is, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, a λ-adapted Borel system of probability measures by Lemma 5.2 a), b) and e). We have for every $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$:

$$\left\| \theta_n^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma \theta_n^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)} \right\| = \left\| \tfrac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k=0}^n \theta^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} * \pi^k - \gamma(\theta^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)} * \pi^k) \right\| = \left\| \tfrac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k=0}^n (\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\theta^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}) * \pi^k \right\|.$$

By assumption, we know that for μ-a.e. $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$, $H_{\pi,x}(\mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}$. In the language of [14], this means that for μ-a.e. $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$, the Poisson boundary of P_x is trivial. Hence [14, Theorem 2.8] implies that for μ-a.e. $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ and λ^x-a.e. $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}^x$, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left\| \tfrac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k=0}^n (\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\theta^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}) * \pi^k \right\| = \lim_{n\to\infty} \left\| \tfrac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k=0}^n (\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} P_{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}^k - \gamma\theta^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)} P_{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}^k) \right\| = 0.$$

By Remark 4.10, $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda, \mu)$ is Reiter. □

In the topological setting, we have the following analogous result.

Theorem 6.2. *Let $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda)$ be a locally compact semigroupoid with quasi-Haar system.*

1) *If $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda)$ is Liouville, then it is Reiter.*
2) *If $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda)$ is tight Liouville, then it is tight Reiter.*
3) *If $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda)$ is continuous Liouville, then it is uniform Reiter.*

Proof. For 1), let $\pi = (\pi_x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ be a λ-adapted continuous system of probability measures on $\mathcal{G}$ such that $H_{\pi,x}(\mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$. Define a new family of measures $\rho = (\rho_x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ by setting $\rho_x := \frac{1}{2}(\pi_x + (\pi * \pi)_x)$. Lemma 5.2 a), c) and e) tell us that ρ is again a λ-adapted continuous system of probability measures on $\mathcal{G}$. Moreover, let $\theta = (\theta^x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ be any λ-adapted continuous system of probability measures. For instance, we could take $\theta^x = \pi_x$. We define, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\theta_n := \theta * \rho^n$. By our assumption, $H_{\pi,x}(\mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$, or in the language of [14], the Poisson boundary of P_x is trivial for all $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$. Hence, combining [14, Theorem 2.6] and [14, Theorem 2.7] as in [15, Proof of Theorem 6.1], we obtain for every $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n\to\infty} \left\| \theta_n^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma \theta_n^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)} \right\| &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \left\| (\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma \theta^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}) * \rho^n \right\| \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \left\| 2^{-n} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} (\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma \theta^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}) * \pi^{n+k} \right\| = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

This proves 1).

For 2), note that if we choose θ and π with the property that $\mathrm{supp}_K(\theta)$ and $\mathrm{supp}_K(\pi)$ are compact for all compact subsets $K \subseteq \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$, then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, θ_n has the same property due to Lemma 5.2 d).

For 3), we choose θ and π such that $\mathcal{G}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$, $(\gamma, \eta) \mapsto \left(d(\gamma\theta_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)})/d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}\right)(\eta)$ and $\mathcal{G}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$, $(\gamma, \eta) \mapsto \left(d(\gamma\pi_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)})/d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}\right)(\eta)$ are bounded and continuous. Then, by Lemma 5.2 f), we know that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, θ_n has the same property. Hence for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the map $\gamma \in \mathcal{G} \mapsto \left\| \theta_n^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma \theta_n^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)} \right\| \in \mathbb{R}$ is continuous. Moreover, these maps form a decreasing sequence (in n) by Lemma 5.2 g). Therefore, Dini's Theorem implies that the convergence in (10) is uniform on compact subsets of $\mathcal{G}$. □

7. Reiter's condition implies Liouville property

Let us now prove that Reiter's condition implies the Liouville property for semigroupoids, both in the measure and topological setting. We follow the same strategy as in the proof of Proposition 2.13 and Theorem 2.14.

Proposition 7.1. *Let $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda, \mu)$ be a measure semigroupoid. If $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda, \mu)$ is Reiter, then there exists a λ-adapted Borel system of probability measures $\pi = (\pi_x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ on $\mathcal{G}$ such that for μ-a.e. $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ and λ^x-a.e. $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}^x$, we have $\lim_{i\to\infty} \left\| \pi^i_{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma \pi^i_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)} \right\| = 0$.*

Proof. Since $L^1(\mathcal{G}^{(0)}, \mu)$ is separable (see Remark 2.1), there exists a sequence of finite subsets $(\mathcal{F}_i)_i$ of $L^1(\mathcal{G}^{(0)}, \mu)_+$ such that $\mathcal{F}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_2 \subseteq \ldots$ and $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_i$ is dense in $L^1(\mathcal{G}^{(0)}, \mu)_+$. Choose

sequences $(t_i)_i$ and $(\varepsilon_i)_i$ in $(0,1)$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} t_i = 1$, $\varepsilon_1 > \varepsilon_2 > \varepsilon_3 > \dots$ and $\lim_{i\to\infty} \varepsilon_i = 0$. As λ is proper (Definition 4.5), we can find an increasing sequence of Borel subsets A_i of $\mathcal{G}$ such that $\mathcal{G} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i$ and $C_i := \sup_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \lambda^x(A_i)$ satisfies $0 < C_i < \infty$. Choose a sequence $(n_i)_i$ of natural numbers such that $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$ and $(t_1 + \dots + t_{i-1})^{n_i} < \frac{\varepsilon_i}{C_i}$.

Let us now choose inductively λ-adapted Borel systems of probability measures $\theta_i = (\theta_i^x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ on $\mathcal{G}$. Let θ_1 be any λ-adapted Borel system of probability measures on $\mathcal{G}$. Now assume that $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{m-1}$ have been chosen. Let

$$\Theta_{m-1} := \left\{\theta_{k_1} * \dots * \theta_{k_j} \colon 1 \le j \le n_m - 1,\, k_j \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}\right\}.$$

Every $\rho \in \Theta_{m-1}$ is λ-adapted by Lemma 5.2 e), and we set $u^x := d\rho^x/d\lambda^x$. For $f \in \mathcal{F}_{m-1}$ and $\rho \in \Theta_{m-1}$, let $\varphi_{f,\rho}(\zeta) = u^{\mathbf{t}(\zeta)} f(\mathbf{t}(\zeta))$. $\varphi_{f,\rho}$ is Borel because ρ is λ-adapted, and we have $\varphi_{f,\rho} \in L^1(\mathcal{G}, \lambda * \mu)$ since

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \varphi_{f,\rho}(\zeta) d\lambda^x(\zeta) \right) d\mu(x) = \int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} u^x(\zeta) d\lambda^x(\zeta) \right) f(x) d\mu(x) \\ = &\int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} d\rho^x(\zeta) \right) f(x) d\mu(x) = \int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} f(x) d\mu(x) < \infty \end{aligned}$$

where ρ^x is a probability measure.

Moreover, given $\rho \in \Theta_{m-1}$, let $v_\gamma(\eta) := \left(d(\gamma\rho^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)})/d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}\right)(\eta)$. For $f \in \mathcal{F}_{m-1}$ and $\rho \in \Theta_{m-1}$, set $\phi_{f,\rho}(\eta) = \int_{\mathcal{G}} v_\gamma(\eta) 1_{A_m}(\gamma) f(\mathbf{t}(\eta)) d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\eta)}(\gamma)$. Again, $\phi_{f,\rho}$ is Borel because ρ is λ-adapted, and $\phi_{f,\rho}$ lies in $L^1(\mathcal{G}, \lambda * \mu)$ because

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \phi_{f,\rho}(\eta) d\lambda^x(\eta) \right) d\mu(x) \\ = &\int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{t}(\eta)}} v_\gamma(\eta) 1_{A_m}(\gamma) f(\mathbf{t}(\eta)) d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\eta)}(\gamma) \right) d\lambda^x(\eta) \right) d\mu(x) \\ = &\int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} v_\gamma(\eta) d\lambda^x(\eta) \right) 1_{A_m}(\gamma) d\lambda^x(\gamma) \right) f(x) d\mu(x) \\ = &\int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} d(\gamma\rho^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}) \right) 1_{A_m}(\gamma) d\lambda^x(\gamma) \right) f(x) d\mu(x) \\ = &\int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} 1_{A_m}(\gamma) d\lambda^x(\gamma) \right) f(x) d\mu(x) \le C_m \cdot \int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} f(x) d\mu(x) < \infty \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma\rho^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}$ is a probability measure.

Since $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda, \mu)$ is Reiter, we can choose θ_m such that

$$\int_{\mathcal{G}} \left\| \theta_m^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\theta_m^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)} \right\| 1_{A_m}(\gamma) f(\mathbf{t}(\gamma)) d(\lambda * \mu)(\gamma) < \varepsilon_m \text{ for all } f \in \mathcal{F}_{m-1}, \tag{11}$$

$$\int_{\mathcal{G}} \left\| \theta_m^{\mathbf{t}(\zeta)} - \zeta\theta_m^{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)} \right\| \varphi_{f,\rho}(\zeta) d(\lambda * \mu)(\zeta) < \tfrac{\varepsilon_m}{C_m} \text{ for all } f \in \mathcal{F}_{m-1} \text{ and } \rho \in \Theta_{m-1} \tag{12}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathcal{G}} \left\|\theta_m^{\mathbf{t}(\eta)} - \eta\theta_m^{\mathbf{s}(\eta)}\right\| \phi_{f,\rho}(\eta) d(\lambda * \mu)(\eta) < \varepsilon_m \text{ for all } f \in \mathcal{F}_{m-1} \text{ and } \rho \in \Theta_{m-1}. \tag{13}$$

Now set $\pi_x := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} t_i \theta_i^x$ for all $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$. $\pi = (\pi_x)$ is again a λ-adapted Borel system of probability measures.

Take $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}_{m-1}$. Set $n := n_m$. Write the n-fold convolution $\pi_x^n = (\pi_1)_x + (\pi_2)_x$ where

$$\begin{aligned}(\pi_1)_x &= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{N}^n \\ \max(\mathbf{k})<m}} t_{k_1}\cdots t_{k_n}(\theta_{k_1} * \cdots * \theta_{k_n})^x, \\ (\pi_2)_x &= \pi_x^n - (\pi_1)_x = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{N}^n \\ \max(\mathbf{k})\geq m}} t_{k_1}\cdots t_{k_n}(\theta_{k_1} * \cdots * \theta_{k_n})^x.\end{aligned}$$

Then $\|(\pi_1)_x\| \leq (t_1 + \cdots + t_{m-1})^{n_m} < \frac{\varepsilon_m}{C_m}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left\|(\pi_1)_{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma(\pi_1)_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| 1_{A_m}(\gamma) d\lambda^x(\gamma) \right) f(x) d\mu(x) \\ < &\int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} 2\tfrac{\varepsilon_m}{C_m} 1_{A_m}(\gamma) d\lambda^x(\gamma) \right) f(x) d\mu(x) \leq 2\varepsilon_m.\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

For $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ with $\max(\mathbf{k}) \geq m$, $\theta_{k_1} * \cdots * \theta_{k_n}$ is of the form $\theta * \tau$ for some $\theta = \theta_k$ with $k \geq m$, or it is of the form $\rho * \theta * \tau$ for some $\rho \in \Theta_{m-1}$ and $\theta = \theta_k$ with $k \geq m$. By (11), we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left\|\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\theta^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| 1_{A_m}(\gamma) d\lambda^x(\gamma) \right) f(x) d\mu(x) < \varepsilon_m. \tag{15}$$

For every $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$, Lemma 5.2 h) implies

$$\|\theta^x - (\rho * \theta)^x\| \leq \int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left\|\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\zeta)} - \zeta\theta^{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)}\right\| d\rho^x(\zeta). \tag{16}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \|\theta^x - (\rho * \theta)^x\| 1_{A_m}(\gamma) d\lambda^x(\gamma) \right) f(x) d\mu(x) \\ \leq\ & C_m \int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \|\theta^x - (\rho * \theta)^x\| f(x) d\mu(x) \\ \overset{(16)}{\leq}\ & C_m \int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left\|\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\zeta)} - \zeta\theta^{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)}\right\| d\rho^x(\zeta) \right) f(x) d\mu(x) \\ =\ & C_m \int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left\|\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\zeta)} - \zeta\theta^{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)}\right\| u^x(\zeta) f(x) d\lambda^x(\zeta) \right) d\mu(x) \\ =\ & C_m \int_{\mathcal{G}} \left\|\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\zeta)} - \zeta\theta^{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)}\right\| \varphi_{f,\rho}(\zeta) d(\lambda * \mu)(\zeta) \overset{(12)}{<} \varepsilon_m.\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

For every $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$, Lemma 5.2 h) implies that

$$\left\|\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma(\rho * \theta)^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| = \left\|\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - (\gamma\rho^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}) * \theta\right\| \leq \int_{\mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}} \left\|\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \eta\theta^{\mathbf{s}(\eta)}\right\| d(\gamma\rho^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)})(\eta). \tag{18}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left\|\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma(\rho * \theta)^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| 1_{A_m}(\gamma) d\lambda^x(\gamma) \right) f(x) d\mu(x) \qquad (19)\\
\overset{(18)}{\leq}\ & \int \left(\int \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left\|\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \eta\theta^{\mathbf{s}(\eta)}\right\| d(\gamma\rho^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)})(\eta) \right) 1_{A_m}(\gamma) d\lambda^x(\gamma) \right) f(x) d\mu(x)\\
=\ & \int \left(\int \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left\|\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\eta)} - \eta\theta^{\mathbf{s}(\eta)}\right\| v_\gamma(\eta) d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}(\eta) \right) 1_{A_m}(\gamma) d\lambda^x(\gamma) \right) f(x) d\mu(x)\\
=\ & \int \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}} \left\|\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\eta)} - \eta\theta^{\mathbf{s}(\eta)}\right\| \left(\int v_\gamma(\eta) 1_{A_m}(\gamma) f(x) d\lambda^x(\gamma) \right) d\lambda^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}(\eta) \right) d\mu(x)\\
=\ & \int_{\mathcal{G}} \left\|\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\eta)} - \eta\theta^{\mathbf{s}(\eta)}\right\| \phi_{f,\rho}(\eta) d(\lambda * \mu)(\eta) \overset{(13)}{<} \varepsilon_m.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (17) and (19), we get

$$\int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left\|(\rho * \theta)^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma(\rho * \theta)^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| 1_{A_m}(\gamma) d\lambda^x(\gamma) \right) f(x) d\mu(x) < 2\varepsilon_m$$

and also for all $m' \leq m$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left\|(\rho * \theta)^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma(\rho * \theta)^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| 1_{A_{m'}}(\gamma) d\lambda^x(\gamma) \right) f(x) d\mu(x) < 2\varepsilon_m. \tag{20}$$

With the help of Lemma 5.2 g), we deduce from (15) and (20) that

$$\int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left\|(\theta * \tau)^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma(\theta * \tau)^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| 1_{A_{m'}}(\gamma) d\lambda^x(\gamma) \right) f(x) d\mu(x) < \varepsilon_m$$

and

$$\int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left\|(\rho * \theta * \tau)^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma(\rho * \theta * \tau)^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| 1_{A_{m'}}(\gamma) d\lambda^x(\gamma) \right) f(x) d\mu(x) < 2\varepsilon_m.$$

As every summand in π_2 is of the form $\theta * \tau$ or $\rho * \theta * \tau$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left\|(\pi_2)_{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma(\pi_2)_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| 1_{A_{m'}}(\gamma) d\lambda^x(\gamma) \right) f(x) d\mu(x) \qquad (21)\\
<\ & \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{N}^n\\ \max(\mathbf{k})\geq m}} t_{k_1} \cdots t_{k_n} \cdot 2\varepsilon_m \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} t_i \right)^n \cdot 2\varepsilon_m = 2\varepsilon_m.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, combining (14) and (21), using Lemma 5.2 g), we obtain, for $m' \leq m$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x} \left\|\pi^i_{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\pi^i_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| 1_{A_{m'}}(\gamma) d\lambda^x(\gamma) \right) f(x) d\mu(x) < 4\varepsilon_m \text{ for all } i \geq n = n_m.$$

Since $\lim_{m\to\infty}\varepsilon_m = 0$, we have, for every $m' \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}_{m'-1}$,

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}\left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x}\left\|\pi^i_{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\pi^i_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| 1_{A_{m'}}(\gamma)d\lambda^x(\gamma)\right) f(x)d\mu(x) = 0 \tag{22}$$

which gives

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\int_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}\left(\int_{\mathcal{G}^x}\left\|\pi^i_{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\pi^i_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| d\lambda^x(\gamma)\right) f(x)d\mu(x) = 0$$

for all $f \in \bigcup_i \mathcal{F}_i$, and hence for all $f \in L^1(\mathcal{G}^{(0)},\mu)$. It follows that for μ-a.e. $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ and λ^x-a.e. $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}^x$, we have $\lim_{i\to\infty}\left\|\pi^i_{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\pi^i_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| = 0$. Here we have used the fact that the sequence $\left(\left\|\pi^i_{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\pi^i_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\|\right)_i$ is decreasing by Lemma 5.2 g). □

Lemma 7.2. *Let $(\mathcal{G},\lambda,\mu)$ be a measure semigroupoid. If there exists a λ-adapted Borel system of probability measures $\pi = (\pi_x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ such that $\lim_{i\to\infty}\left\|\pi^i_{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\pi^i_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| = 0$ for μ-a.e. $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ and λ^x-a.e. $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}^x$, then we have $H_{\pi,x}(\mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}$ for μ-a.e. $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$.*

Proof. Take $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ such that $\lim_{i\to\infty}\left\|\pi^i_{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\pi^i_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| = 0$ for λ^x-a.e. $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}^x$. Let $f \in L^\infty(\mathcal{G}^x,\lambda^x)$ satisfy $P_x(f) = f$. Then $f = P^i_x(f)$ gives $f(x) = \int_{\mathcal{G}^x} f(\zeta)d\pi^i_x(\zeta)$, and for λ^x-a.e. $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}^x$, $f(\gamma) = \int_{\mathcal{G}^x} f(\gamma\zeta)d\pi^i_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}(\zeta)$. Therefore

$$|f(x) - f(\gamma)| = \left|\left\langle \pi^i_{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\pi^i_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}, f\right\rangle\right| \le \|f\|_\infty \cdot \left\|\pi^i_{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\pi^i_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0.$$

This means that for λ^x-a.e. $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}^x$, we have $f(\gamma) = f(x)$ and f is constant λ^x-a.e. □

From Proposition 7.1 and Lemma 7.2, we have established the following theorem.

Theorem 7.3. *Let $(\mathcal{G},\lambda,\mu)$ be a measure semigroupoid. If $(\mathcal{G},\lambda,\mu)$ is Reiter, then it is Liouville.*

We now discuss topological semigroupoids.

Proposition 7.4. *Let $(\mathcal{G},\lambda)$ be a locally compact semigroupoid with quasi-Haar system. If $(\mathcal{G},\lambda)$ is uniform and tight Reiter, then there exists a λ-adapted continuous system of probability measures $\pi = (\pi_x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ such that*

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\left\|\pi^i_{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\pi^i_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| = 0 \text{ for all } \gamma \in \mathcal{G}.$$

Proof. Since $\mathcal{G}$ is σ-compact (see § 4), there exists a sequence of compact subsets $(C_i)_i$ of $\mathcal{G}$ such that $C_0 \subseteq C_1 \subseteq C_2 \subseteq \dots$ and $\mathcal{G} = \bigcup_{i=0}^\infty C_i$. Choose sequences $(t_i)_i$ and $(\varepsilon_i)_i$ in $(0,1)$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^\infty t_i = 1$, $\varepsilon_1 > \varepsilon_2 > \varepsilon_3 > \dots$ and $\lim_{i\to\infty}\varepsilon_i = 0$. Furthermore, choose a sequence $(n_i)_i$ of natural numbers such that $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$ and $(t_1 + \dots + t_{i-1})^{n_i} < \varepsilon_i$.

Let us now inductively choose λ-adapted continuous systems of probability measures $\theta_i = (\theta^x_i)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$. Let θ_1 be such a continuous system of probability measures with $\left\|\theta_1^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\theta_1^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| < \varepsilon_1$ for all $\gamma \in C_0$. Now assume that $\theta_1,\dots,\theta_{m-1}$ have been chosen. Let

$$\Theta_{m-1} := \left\{\theta_{k_1} * \dots * \theta_{k_j} \colon 1 \le j \le n_m - 1,\ k_j \in \{1,\dots,m-1\}\right\}.$$

Lemma 5.2 e) implies that every $\rho \in \Theta_{m-1}$ is λ-adapted. Moreover, for $K \subseteq \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ compact, set $\mathrm{supp}_K(\Theta_{m-1}) := \bigcup_{\rho\in\Theta_{m-1}} \mathrm{supp}_K(\rho)$. Then, by Lemma 5.2 d), $\mathrm{supp}_K(\Theta_{m-1})$ is compact for every compact subset $K \subseteq \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$. Now choose θ_m such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\|\theta_m^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\theta_m^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| < \varepsilon_m \\ &\text{for all } \gamma \in \mathrm{supp}_{\mathbf{t}(C_{m-1})}(\Theta_{m-1}) \cup (C_{m-1} \cdot \mathrm{supp}_{\mathbf{s}(C_{m-1})}(\Theta_{m-1})) \cup C_{m-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Such θ_m exist since $\mathcal{G}$ is uniform and tight Reiter.

Now set $\pi_x := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} t_i\theta_i^x$ for all $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$. $\pi = (\pi_x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ is again a λ-adapted continuous system of probability measures.

Take $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\gamma \in C_{m-1}$. Set $n := n_m$. Write $\pi_x^n = (\pi_1)_x + (\pi_2)_x$ where

$$\begin{aligned} (\pi_1)_x &= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{N}^n \\ \max(\mathbf{k})<m}} t_{k_1}\cdots t_{k_n}(\theta_{k_1} * \cdots * \theta_{k_n})^x, \\ (\pi_2)_x &= \pi_x^n - (\pi_1)_x = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{N}^n \\ \max(\mathbf{k})\geq m}} t_{k_1}\cdots t_{k_n}(\theta_{k_1} * \cdots * \theta_{k_n})^x. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\|(\pi_1)_x\| \leq (t_1 + \cdots + t_{m-1})^{n_m} < \varepsilon_m$ for all $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$. Therefore, $\left\|\gamma(\pi_1)_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| < \varepsilon_m$. Thus we obtain

$$\left\|(\pi_1)_{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma(\pi_1)_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| < 2\varepsilon_m. \tag{24}$$

For $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ with $\max(\mathbf{k}) \geq m$, $\theta_{k_1} * \cdots * \theta_{k_n}$ is of the form $\theta * \tau$ for some $\theta = \theta_k$ with $k \geq m$, or it is of the form $\rho * \theta * \tau$ for some $\rho \in \Theta_{m-1}$ and $\theta = \theta_k$ with $k \geq m$. By choice of θ_i, we have

$$\left\|\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\theta^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| \overset{(23)}{<} \varepsilon_m. \tag{25}$$

Moreover, it follows that from Lemma 5.2 h) that

$$\left\|\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - (\rho * \theta)^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}\right\| \leq \int_{\mathrm{supp}\,(\rho^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)})} \left\|\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\zeta)} - \zeta\theta^{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)}\right\| d\rho^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}(\zeta) \overset{(23)}{<} \varepsilon_m. \tag{26}$$

Similarly, Lemma 5.2 h) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma(\rho * \theta)^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| &= \left\|\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - (\gamma\rho^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}) * \theta\right\| \leq \int_{\mathcal{G}} \left\|\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \zeta\theta^{\mathbf{s}(\zeta)}\right\| d(\gamma\rho^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)})(\zeta) \\ &= \int_{\mathrm{supp}\,(\rho^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)})} \left\|\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma\eta)} - \gamma\eta\theta^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma\eta)}\right\| d\rho^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}(\eta) \overset{(23)}{<} \varepsilon_m. \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Combining (26) and (27), we get

$$\left\|(\rho * \theta)^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma(\rho * \theta)^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| < 2\varepsilon_m. \tag{28}$$

Therefore, because of (25) and (28), Lemma 5.2 g) implies $\left\|(\theta * \tau)^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma(\theta * \tau)^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| < \varepsilon_m$ and $\left\|(\rho * \theta * \tau)^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma(\rho * \theta * \tau)^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| < 2\varepsilon_m$. As every summand in π_2 is of the form $\theta * \tau$ or $\rho * \theta * \tau$,

we obtain

$$\left\|(\pi_2)_{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma(\pi_2)_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| < \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{N}^n \\ \max(\mathbf{k})\geq m}} t_{k_1}\cdots t_{k_n}\cdot 2\varepsilon_m \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} t_i\right)^n \cdot 2\varepsilon_m = 2\varepsilon_m. \tag{29}$$

Finally, combining (24) and (29), we get using Lemma 5.2 g)

$$\left\|\pi^i_{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\pi^i_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| < 4\varepsilon_m \text{ for all } i \geq n.$$

On the whole, we deduce that for every $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$,

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \left\|\pi^i_{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\pi^i_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| = 0.$$

□

Lemma 7.5. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a topological semigroupoid with a quasi-Haar system λ. Suppose that there exists a λ-adapted continuous system of probability measures $\pi = (\pi_x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ such that $\lim_{i\to\infty}\left\|\pi^i_{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\pi^i_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| = 0$ for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}^x$. Then we have $H_{\pi,x}(\mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$.*

Proof. Take $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ and $f \in L^\infty(\mathcal{G}^x, \lambda^x)$ with $P_x(f) = f$. Then $f = P^i_x(f)$ and $f(x) = \int_{\mathcal{G}^x} f(\zeta)d\pi^i_x(\zeta)$ and also, $f(\gamma) = \int_{\mathcal{G}^x} f(\gamma\zeta)d\pi^i_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}(\zeta)$ for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}^x$. Therefore $|f(x) - f(\gamma)| = \left|\left\langle \pi^i_{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\pi^i_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}, f\right\rangle\right| \leq \|f\|_\infty \cdot \left\|\pi^i_{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\pi^i_{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$. This means that for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}^x$, we have $f(\gamma) = f(x)$ and hence f is constant. This proves $H_{\pi,x}(\mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}$. □

Finally, Proposition 7.4 and Lemma 7.5 together yield the following result.

Theorem 7.6. *Let $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda)$ be a locally compact semigroupoid with quasi-Haar system. If $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda)$ is uniform and tight Reiter, then it is Liouville.*

8. Special cases

In this last section, we discuss three important special cases, namely groupoids, transformation semigroups and locally compact semigroups. We begin with groupoids.

8.1. **Groupoids.** An important consequence of our previous results is the equivalence of the Liouville property and amenability for groupoids, in both measure and topological settings. In particular, we settle a conjecture of Kaimanovich [15, Conjecture 4.6] by showing that amenable groupoids admit the Liouville property. To be precise, combining Theorem 6.1 and Theorem 7.3, we obtain the following result for measure groupoids.

Theorem 8.1. *Let $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda, \mu)$ be a measured groupoid, where λ is a left Haar system. Then $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda, \mu)$ is Liouville if and only if it is Reiter.*

Since amenability and Reiter's condition are equivalent for groupoids, this theorem establishes the equivalence of the Liouville property and amenability for measure groupoids.

In the topological setting, we need a lemma first.

Lemma 8.2. *Let $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda)$ be a locally compact groupoid, where λ is a left Haar system. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda)$ *is Reiter,*
(ii) $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda)$ *is uniform Reiter,*
(iii) $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda)$ *is tight Reiter.*

Proof. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) follows from [27, Theorem 2.14]. (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) is obvious. It remains to prove (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii).

We show that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $C \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ compact, there exists a λ-adapted continuous system of probability measures $\theta = (\theta^x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ on $\mathcal{G}$ such that $\left\|\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\theta^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| < \varepsilon$ for all $\gamma \in C$, and in addition, $\mathrm{supp}_K(\theta)$ is compact for every compact subset $K \subseteq \mathcal{G}$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $C \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ compact be given. Since $\mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ is locally compact and σ-compact, there exist compact subsets K_n of $\mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ with $\mathbf{s}(C) \cup \mathbf{t}(C) \subseteq K_1$, $K_n \subseteq \overset{\circ}{K}_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{G}^{(0)} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n$.

Since $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda)$ is Reiter, $\mathcal{G}$ is amenable and hence there exists a *topological approximate invariant density* $(g_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}$ in $C_c(\mathcal{G})$, as defined in [27, Definition 2.7]). Normalizing $g_j \cdot \lambda^x$ for some j and for each $x \in K_2$, we obtain a λ-adapted continuous system of measures $\vartheta_2 = (\vartheta_2^x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ such that

$$\left\|\vartheta_2^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\vartheta_2^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| < \varepsilon \text{ for all } \gamma \in C \tag{30}$$

with the additional properties that $\mathrm{supp}_{K_2}(\vartheta_2)$ is compact and ϑ_2^x is a probability measure for all $x \in K_2$. Likewise, for all $n \geq 3$, one can find λ-adapted continuous systems of measures $\vartheta_n = (\vartheta_n^x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ such that $\mathrm{supp}_{K_n}(\vartheta_n)$ is compact and ϑ_n^x is a probability measure for all $x \in K_n$.

Now define $U_2 := \overset{\circ}{K}_2$ and $U_n := \overset{\circ}{K}_n \setminus K_{n-2}$ for all $n \geq 3$. By construction, $\mathcal{G}^{(0)} = \bigcup_{n=2}^{\infty} U_n$. Since $\mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ is locally compact and σ-compact, $\mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ is paracompact and one can find a partition of unity $\{h_n\}_{n \geq 2}$ subordinate to $\{U_n\}_{n \geq 2}$. Define

$$\theta_n^x := \begin{cases} h_n(x)\vartheta_2^x & \text{for } x \in U_n, \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

By construction, these θ_n are λ-adapted continuous systems of measures such that $\mathrm{supp}\,(\theta_n) := \mathrm{supp}_{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}}(\theta_n) \subseteq \mathrm{supp}_{K_n}(\vartheta_n)$. In particular, $\mathrm{supp}\,(\theta_n)$ is compact.

Set $\theta^x := \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \theta_n^x$ which is a finite sum since the cover $\{U_n\}$ is locally finite. As each θ_n is λ-adapted, so is the continuous system $\theta = (\theta^x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ where $\|\theta^x\| = \sum_n \|\theta_n^x\| = \sum_n h_n(x) = 1$.

We claim that θ has the desired properties. Indeed, given $\gamma \in C$, both $\mathbf{t}(\gamma)$ and $\mathbf{s}(\gamma)$ lie in K_1, hence $h_n(\mathbf{t}(\gamma)) = h_n(\mathbf{s}(\gamma)) = 0$ for all $n \geq 3$, and so $h_2(\mathbf{t}(\gamma)) = h_2(\mathbf{s}(\gamma)) = 1$. Thus $\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} = \theta_2^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} = \vartheta_2^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)}$, and also $\theta^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)} = \theta_2^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)} = \vartheta_2^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}$. It follows that

$$\left\|\theta^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\theta^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| = \left\|\vartheta_2^{\mathbf{t}(\gamma)} - \gamma\vartheta_2^{\mathbf{s}(\gamma)}\right\| \overset{(30)}{<} \varepsilon.$$

Finally, given $K \subseteq \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ compact, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $K \subseteq \bigcup_{n=2}^{N} U_n$, so that $h_n|_K \equiv 0$ for all $n \geq N + 2$. Hence $\mathrm{supp}_K(\theta) \subseteq \bigcup_{n=2}^{N+1} \mathrm{supp}\,(\theta_n)$ which is compact. □

Combining Theorem 6.2 and Theorem 7.6 with the previous lemma, we obtain the equivalence of the Liouville property and Reiter's condition in the topological setting. This also proves the topological analogue of [15, Conjecture 4.6].

Theorem 8.3. *Let $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda)$ be a locally compact groupoid, where λ is a left Haar system. Then $(\mathcal{G}, \lambda)$ is Liouville if and only if it is Reiter.*

Remark 8.4. By convention, all our locally compact groupoids are locally compact and second countable. However, the same proofs as above show that Lemma 8.2 and Theorem 8.3 also hold for topological groupoids which are locally compact and σ-compact.

8.2. **Transformation semigroups.** We now show the equivalence of the Liouville property and Reiter's condition for transformation semigroups. First, combining Theorem 6.1 and Theorem 7.3, one obtains the following result in the measure setting.

Theorem 8.5. *Let (X, μ) be an analytic Borel space. Let S be a discrete semigroup acting on X by Borel maps. Let $(X \rtimes S, \lambda, \mu)$ be the corresponding measured semigroupoid. Then $(X \rtimes S, \lambda, \mu)$ is Liouville if and only if it is Reiter.*

For the topological setting, we prove a lemma first.

Lemma 8.6. *Let X be a locally compact and second countable Hausdorff space, and S a countable discrete semigroup acting on X by continuous maps. Let $(X \rtimes S, \lambda)$ be the corresponding locally compact semigroupoid with quasi-Haar system. The following are equivalent:*

(i) *$(X \rtimes S, \lambda)$ is uniform Reiter,*
(ii) *$(X \rtimes S, \lambda)$ is uniform and tight Reiter,*
(iii) *For each $\varepsilon > 0$, finite set $F \subseteq S$ and compact set $C \subseteq X$, there exists a family $\theta = (\theta^x)_{x \in X}$ of probability measures on S satisfying the following conditions:*
  (1) *the map $x \in X \mapsto \theta^x \in \ell^1(S)$ is continuous;*
  (2) *$\|\theta^x - s\theta^{x.s}\| < \varepsilon$ for all $s \in F$ and $x \in C$;*
  (3) *$\operatorname{supp}(\theta) := \bigcup_{x \in X} \operatorname{supp}(\theta^x)$ is finite.*

Proof. Clearly, we have (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i). It remains to prove (i) $\Rightarrow$ (iii). Let $\varepsilon > 0$ with a finite set $F \subseteq S$ and compact set $C \subseteq X$ given in (iii). Since $(X \rtimes S, \lambda)$ is uniform Reiter, there is a family of probability measures $\vartheta = (\vartheta^x)_{x \in X}$ on S such that the map $x \in X \mapsto \vartheta^x \in \ell^1(S)$ is continuous and $\|\vartheta^x - \delta_s * \vartheta^{x.s}\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ for all $s \in F$ and $x \in C$. Since X is locally compact and σ-compact, there exist compact subsets K_n of X with $C \cup C.F \subseteq K_1$, $K_n \subseteq K_{n+1}^{\circ}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $X = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n$.

Let us now define probability measures ϑ_2^x on S for all $x \in K_2$ such that the map $x \in K_2 \mapsto \vartheta_2^x \in \ell^1(S)$ is continuous. For $1 > \varepsilon' > 0$ and $x \in K_2$, there exists a finite set $E_x \subseteq S$ such that $\left\|\sum_{s \in E_x} \vartheta^x(s)\delta_s - \vartheta^x\right\| < \varepsilon'$. As $y \in X \mapsto \vartheta^y \in \ell^1(S)$ is continuous, the map $y \in X \mapsto \sum_{s \in E_x} \vartheta^y(s)\delta_s - \vartheta^y \in \ell^1(S)$ is continuous as well. Hence there exists an open neighbourhood U_x of x such that $\left\|\sum_{s \in F_x} \vartheta^y(s)\delta_s - \vartheta^y\right\| < \varepsilon'$ for all $y \in U_x$. Since K_2 is compact, there exist finitely many $x_1, \ldots, x_N$ in K_2 such that $K_2 \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{N} U_{x_i}$. Define $E := \bigcup_{i=1}^{N} E_{x_i}$ and for $x \in K_2$, set $\tilde{\vartheta}_2^x := \sum_{s \in E} \vartheta^x(s)$. Obviously, the map $x \in K_2 \mapsto \tilde{\vartheta}_2^x \in \ell^1(S)$ is continuous. For all $x \in K_2$, we have $\left\|\tilde{\vartheta}_2^x\right\| \geq \|\vartheta^x\| - \left\|\tilde{\vartheta}_2^x - \vartheta^x\right\| > 1 - \varepsilon'$. Thus we may form $\vartheta_2^x := \left\|\tilde{\vartheta}_2^x\right\|^{-1} \cdot \tilde{\vartheta}_2^x$ for all $x \in K_2$. By construction, ϑ_2^x are probability measures on S such that the map $x \in K_2 \mapsto \vartheta_2^x \in \ell^1(S)$ is

continuous. Moreover, for all $x \in K_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\vartheta_2^x - \vartheta^x\| &\leq \left\|\vartheta_2^x - \tilde{\vartheta}_2^x\right\| + \left\|\tilde{\vartheta}_2^x - \vartheta^x\right\| = \left(\left\|\tilde{\vartheta}_2^x\right\|^{-1} - 1\right)\left\|\tilde{\vartheta}_2^x\right\| + \left\|\tilde{\vartheta}_2^x - \vartheta^x\right\| \\ &< (1-\varepsilon')^{-1} - 1 + \varepsilon' < \tfrac{\varepsilon}{4} \end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently small ε'. Hence it follows that for all $s \in E$ and $x \in C$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\vartheta_2^x - \delta_s * \vartheta_2^{x.s}\| &\leq \|\vartheta_2^x - \vartheta^x\| + \|\vartheta^x - \delta_s * \vartheta^{x.s}\| + \|\delta_s * \vartheta^{x.s} - \delta_s * \vartheta_2^{x.s}\| \\ &< \tfrac{\varepsilon}{4} + \tfrac{\varepsilon}{2} + \tfrac{\varepsilon}{4} = \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Now define $U_2 := \mathring{K}_2$ and $U_n := \mathring{K}_n \backslash K_{n-2}$ for all $n \geq 3$. By construction, we have $\mathring{K}_n \backslash \mathring{K}_{n-1} \subseteq U_n$ for all $n \geq 3$, and $X \subseteq \bigcup_{n=2}^\infty K_{n-1} \subseteq \bigcup_{n=2}^\infty \mathring{K}_n \subseteq \bigcup_{n=2}^\infty U_n$. Since X is locally compact and σ-compact, we can find a partition of unity $\{h_n\}_{n\geq 2}$ subordinate to $\{U_n\}_{n\geq 2}$. Define

$$\theta_2^x := \begin{cases} h_2(x)\vartheta_2^x & \text{for } x \in U_2, \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Then the map $x \in X \mapsto \theta_2^x \in \ell^1(S)$ is continuous. Now fix $t \in S$ and define, for $n \geq 3$, $\theta_n^x := h_n(x)\delta_t$. Set $\theta^x := \sum_{n=2}^\infty \theta_n^x$.

We claim that θ has the desired properties. For every $x \in X$, $\|\theta_n^x\| = h_n(x)$ implies $\|\theta^x\| = \sum_n h_n(x) = 1$ and θ^x are probability measures. Moreover, given $x \in X$, there exist $N \geq 2$ such that x lies in U_N. But by construction, $U_N \subseteq K_N$ implies $U_N \cap U_n = \emptyset$ for all $n \geq N+2$. Therefore, $\theta^x = \sum_{n=2}^{N+1} \theta_n^x$ for all $x \in U_N$. This shows continuity of the map $x \in U_N \mapsto \theta^x \in \ell^1(S)$ and $x \in X \mapsto \theta^x \in \ell^1(S)$. Furthermore, it is clear that for all $x \in X$, we have $\operatorname{supp}(\theta^x) \subseteq E \cup \{t\}$. Finally, given $s \in F$ and $x \in C$, both x and $x.s$ lie in K_1 and hence $h_n(x) = h_n(x.s) = 0$ for all $n \geq 3$, and $h_2(x) = h_2(x.s) = 1$. Therefore $\theta^x = \theta_2^x = \vartheta_2^x$ and $\theta^{x.s} = \theta_2^{x.s} = \vartheta_2^{x.s}$. We conclude that

$$\|\theta^x - \delta_s * \theta^{x.s}\| = \|\vartheta_2^x - \delta_s * \vartheta_2^{x.s}\| \overset{(31)}{<} \varepsilon.$$

□

We observe from the definition that the transformation semigroupoid $(X \rtimes S, \lambda)$ in the above lemma is Liouville if and only if it is continuous Liouville, and now, using Theorem 6.2 and Theorem 7.6, we can conclude with the following result.

Theorem 8.7. *Let X be a locally compact and second countable Hausdorff space, and S a countable discrete semigroup acting on X by continuous maps. Let $(X \rtimes S, \lambda)$ be the corresponding locally compact semigroupoid with quasi-Haar system. Then $(X \rtimes S, \lambda)$ is Liouville if and only if it is uniform Reiter.*

8.3. **Semigroups.** Let S be a second countable locally compact semigroup equipped with a (nonzero) Borel measure λ such that $s\lambda \prec \lambda$ and the map $(s,t) \in S \times S \mapsto (d(s\lambda)/d\lambda)(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ is Borel. As explained in Remark 4.7, by identifying S with $\{\mathrm{pt}\} \rtimes S$, we may view (S, λ) as a locally compact semigroupoid with quasi-Haar system. In this case, (S, λ) is Reiter, in the sense of Definition 4.11, if there exists a sequence (θ_n) of Borel probability measures on S with $\theta_n \prec \lambda$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|\theta_n - s\theta_n\| = 0$ for all $s \in S$.

Remark 8.8. In the above situation, (S, λ) is Reiter if and only if there exists a left invariant mean on $L^\infty(S, \lambda)$ since the proof in [19, § 4.2] carries over. Therefore there is no difference between Reiter's condition and amenability for (S, λ). However, this need not be the case for all metric semigroups in § 2, which are not assumed to admit such a measure λ.

To describe the Liouville property explicitly for (S, λ), in the sense of Definition 4.15, let π be a probability measure on S with $\pi \prec \lambda$. Define the Markov operator $P : L^\infty(S, \lambda) \to L^\infty(S, \lambda)$ by $P(f)(s) := \int_S f(st)d\pi(t)$ and let $H_\pi(S) := \{f \in L^\infty(S, \lambda) \colon P(f) = f\}$ be the space of π-harmonic functions in $L^\infty(S, \lambda)$. Then (S, λ) is Liouville if there exists a probability measure π on S with $\pi \prec \lambda$ such that $H_\pi(S) = \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}$.

Theorem 8.9. *In the situation described above, (S, λ) is Liouville if and only if it is Reiter.*

Proof. The key observation is that, by definition, (S, λ) is Liouville if and only if $(\{\mathrm{pt}\} \rtimes S, \delta \times \lambda, \delta)$ is Liouville as a measure semigroupoid (where δ is the point mass). By Theorem 6.2, we know that (S, λ) is Reiter if it is Liouville. For the converse, let (S, λ) be Reiter. This means that (S, λ) is Reiter as a locally compact semigroupoid with quasi-Haar system. But by definition, this implies that $(\{\mathrm{pt}\} \rtimes S, \delta \times \lambda, \delta)$ is Reiter as a measure semigroupoid. Hence Theorem 7.3 implies that $(\{\mathrm{pt}\} \rtimes S, \delta \times \lambda, \delta)$ is Liouville as a measure semigroupoid. Our observation above leads us to conclude that (S, λ) is Liouville. □

The question remains which semigroups admit a measure λ as above. This is for instance the case if S is a locally compact subsemigroup of a second countable locally compact group G, that is, S is a subsemigroup of G as well as a locally compact subspace. If the Haar measure λ_G on G satisfies $\lambda_G(S) \neq 0$, then the restriction λ of λ_G to S is a measure with the desired properties.

Of course, another class of examples is given by countable discrete semigroups S with identity and counting measure λ. In this case, we have $LUC(S) = \ell^\infty(S)$ and, Reiter's condition and amenablity for S defined in § 2 are identical with those defined for the semigroupoid (S, λ). We conclude from Remark 8.8 and Theorem 8.9 the following result, where the Liouville property is also the same as the one defined in § 2.

Theorem 8.10. *Let S be a countable discrete semigroup with identity. The following conditions are equivalent.*

(i) *S is Liouville, that is, there exists a probability measure π on S such that every bounded π-harmonic function is constant;*
(ii) *S is Reiter, that is, there exists a sequence $(\theta_n)_n$ of probability measures on S such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|\theta_n - s\theta_n\| = 0$ for all $s \in S$;*
(iii) *S is amenable, that is, there exists a left invariant mean on $\ell^\infty(S)$.*

References

[1] C. Anantharaman-Delaroche and J. Renault, *Amenable groupoids*, L'Enseignement mathématique, no. 36, Geneva, 2000.
[2] W. Arveson, *An invitation to C*-algebra*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1976.
[3] R. Azencott, *Espaces de Poisson des groupes localement compacts*, Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 148, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1970.
[4] G. Choquet, *Lectures on analysis*, Vol. I, II, W.A. Benjamin, Reading, Massachusetts, 1969.

[5] C.-H. Chu, *Matrix-valued harmonic functions on groups*, J. reine angew. Math. *552* (2002), 15–52.
[6] C.-H. Chu and T. Hilberdink, *The convolution equation of Choquet and Deny on nilpotent groups*, Integr. Equat. Oper. Th. *26* (1996), 1–13.
[7] C.-H. Chu and A. T.-M. Lau, *Harmonic functions on topological groups and symmetric spaces*, Math. Z. *268* (2011), 649–673.
[8] A. Connes, *Von Neumann algebras*, Proc. of ICM (Helsinki 1978), Acad. Sci. Fennica, Helsinki, 1980, pp. 97–109.
[9] L. Davies and D. N. Shanbhag, *A generalization of a theorem of Deny with applications in characterization problems*, Quart. J. Math. *38* (1987), 13–34.
[10] E. B. Dynkin and M. B. Malyutov, *Random walks on groups with a finite number of generators*, Sov. Math. Doklady *2* (1961), 399–402.
[11] A. Erschler, *Liouville property for groups and manifolds*, Invent. Math. *155* (2004), 55–80.
[12] H. Furstenberg, *Boundary theory and stochastic processes on homogeneous spaces*, in Harmonic Analysis on Homogeneous Spaces (Proc. of Symposia in Pure Math., Vol. XXVI, Williams Coll., Williamstown, Mass., 1972), AMS, Providence, R.I., 1973, pp. 193–229.
[13] G. A. Hunt, *Semi-groups of measures on Lie groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. *81* (1956), 263–293.
[14] V. A. Kaimanovich, *Measure-theoretic boundaries of Markov chains,* 0-2 *laws and entropy*, in Harmonic Analysis and Discrete Potential Theory (Frascati, 1991), Plenum, New York, 1992, pp. 145–180.
[15] V. A. Kaimanovich, *Amenability and the Liouville property*, Israel Journal of Math. *149* (2004), 45–85.
[16] V. A. Kaimanovich and A. M. Vershik, *Random walks on discrete groups: Boundary and entropy*, Ann. Probab. *11* (1983), 457–490.
[17] K.-S. Lau and W.-B. Zeng, *The convolution equation of Choquet and Deny on semigroups*, Studia Math. *97* (1990), 115–135.
[18] K. Kuratowski, *Topology*, Vol. I, Academic Press, New York, 1966.
[19] X. Li, *Semigroup C*-algebras and amenability of semigroups*, J. Funct. Anal. *262* (2012), 4302–4340.
[20] G. A. Margulis, *Positive harmonic functions on nilpotent groups*, Sov. Math. Doklady *166* (1966), 241–244.
[21] N. Ozawa, *Amenable actions and applications*, Proc. of the ICM (Madrid 2006), Vol. II, EMS Publishing House, 2007, pp. 1624–1650.
[22] K. R. Parathasarathy, *Probability measures on metric spaces*, AMS Chelsea Publ., Providence R.I. 2005.
[23] A. T. Paterson, *Amenability*, Math. Surveys Monogr., Vol. 29, AMS, Providence, RI, 1988.
[24] C. R. Rao and D. N. Shanbhag, *Further extensions of the Choquet-Deny and Deny Theorems with applications in characterization theory*, Q. J. Math. *40* (1989), 333–350.
[25] C. R. Rao and D. N. Shanbhag, *An elementary proof for an extended version of the Choquet-Deny theorem*, *38* (1991), 141-148.
[26] J. Renault, *A groupoid approach to C*-algebras*, Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 793, Springer, Berlin, 1980.
[27] J. Renault, *Topological amenability is a Borel property*, arXiv:1302.0636, to appear in Math. Scand.
[28] M. Rørdam, *Structure and classification of C*-algebras*, Proc. of the ICM (Madrid 2006), Vol. II, EMS Publishing House, 2007, pp. 1581–1598.
[29] J. Rosenblatt, *Ergodic and mixing random walks on locally compact groups*, Math. Ann. *257* (1981), 31–42.
[30] S. Willard, *General topology*, Addison-Wesley, Reading MA, 1970.
[31] S.-T. Yau, *Harmonic functions on complete Riemannian manifolds*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. *28* (1975), 201–228.
[32] R. J. Zimmer, *Hyperfinite factors and amenable ergodic actions*, Invent. Math. *41* (1977), 23–31.
[33] R. J. Zimmer, *Amenable ergodic group actions and an application to Poisson boundaries of random walks*, J. Funct. Anal. *27* (1978), 350–372.

School of Mathematical Sciences, Queen Mary, University of London, London E1 4NS, UK
E-mail address: c.chu@qmul.ac.uk, xin.li@qmul.ac.uk